

THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW
OF
THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.
JANUARY, 1890.

ARTICLE I.

EMOTIONAL METHODS IN RELIGION

By PROF. W. H. WYNN, PH. D., Midland College, Atchison, Kansas.

There is no one of mature years, and sensitive temperament, who has not, at one time or another, felt himself fully under the spell of the natural beauty of this world. At some favored moment the strange fascination floated in upon him, through the eye or the ear, and laid its sweet sovereignty upon him, and swallowed him up in its ineffable bliss. It may have been in its milder or more imposing forms. It may have been a peaceful valley sleeping among the hills, cattle browsing in the meadows, a rivulet swaying this way and that far into the shimmering plain, the cottage sheltered behind the trees, the smoke hanging quietly on the golden glow of the evening sky. Or it may have been the mountains, or the sea, or the thunder-rifted cloud rolling in blackened masses on the horizon when the storm had cleared away. Or it may have been Niagara, a whole ocean weight of waters dropping from the clouds, and crashing into the bosom of the planet, with a roar and a riot that, heard once, will never cease to echo in the soul. Whatever has been the occasion, the rare rich experience of the moment was, that the thinking faculties had sunk into a state of trance-like suspense,

VOL. XX. No. 1.

I

and the whole spiritual nature of the man was emotionally overwhelmed.

Æsthetic Emotions—how do they work?—Where feeling gets in the lead of our mental processes, those processes are difficult to explain. Nor are we concerned much for physiological or psychological subtleties in a region like this. Trance, hypnotism, the mesmeric state—the whole vocabulary of the occult science-mongers of to-day may come, in the course of further researches, to have a meaning that we can intelligently grasp; but for the present we are satisfied to speak of these states in the spontaneous metaphorical language to which poetry resorts.

—“Oft in these moments such a holy calm
Would overspread my soul, that bodily eyes
Were utterly forgotten, and what I saw
Appeared *like something in myself*, a dream,
A prospect of the mind.”

Using the dialect of symbol, I would say that on all occasions of the rapt contemplation of the beautiful, the soul in a manner dissolves into the scene, is caught up, and whirled away, and lost in it, as by a momentary suffusion of the whole being with the streaming glories of a diviner atmosphere pouring in hitherward over sun and stars. Or, yielding a little, as I see I must, to some of the finer speculations of philosophy, I may say with one of the great German masters, that in times of the intensest emotion the subject and object coalesce in one; the soul fuses with something akin to it in the natural world; the thought of the beholder blends in some way wholly with the divine thought in the object beheld. In that one blissful moment, at the climax of its ecstasy—

“In such *access of mind*, in such high hour
Of visitation from the living God,
Thought was not, in enjoyment it expired.”

Philosopher and Poet over a Paradox.—The tripod again! I had thought to have tarried longer round the philosopher's chair. But to return to the company of the wise ones, I find them speaking of these high moments as seasons in which the mind wakes up “to find itself” in the deeper intimations of the object over which it broods. “To find itself” is to come to in-

tensified consciousness in a state of spiritual exaltation, in which the poet Wordsworth was assured that thought was comatose—"in enjoyment it expired." The mind finds itself in the outer world, when, in a flash of enlightenment, or a gleam of inspiration, if you please, it discovers there what in its ordinary and commonplace experiences it did not suspect, the broodings of a larger mind, the feeling of a living something yonder, always akin to itself. So says the philosopher, but the poet seems to dissent. Is there a controversy here, and are these two great leaders of the human kind fundamentally at outs?

We have only the interest of analogy in this great question—the desire to pick up from the province of the beautiful some underlying law of the mind that we may carry over into the field of Christian economics, and put it into a helpful application there. We must, therefore, dwell somewhat patiently on the paradox, that the moments of the soul's highest exaltation, over the beautiful for example, are at once seasons of the intensest self-consciousness and proportionately seasons of the blissful quiescence of thought, and over this paradox we must see the great German philosopher and the poet Wordsworth striking hands.

The poet has climbed up on some bold headland that overlooks the sea, and when the sun rises, there is such a flood of glory pouring in upon his spirit, such a rush of feeling whelming every avenue of sense, that he conceives himself sinking away into an abyss of enjoyment, and characterizes the rapt moment of his ecstasy as a trance of thought. The philosopher looking at it from another point of view, asserts that at that very moment thought was waked up to find its infinite counterpart in the outer world. To which of these must we turn? Does thought expire with the rise of ecstatic feeling, or is ecstasy itself only an intensified and supra-conscious condition of the over-activity of thought? Indeed the poet, in the very same strain of inspired utterance in which he speaks of thought expiring, drops an expression which implicitly conveys all that the philosopher would ask in the premises—"In such access of mind." Access of mind! what does that mean? Is the poet subject to the conflicting experience of the influx of the divine

mind and the collapse of his own individual thought? The unmeasured expanses of the sea, now all flooded with the glories of the morning sun, have opened the poet's spirit to the inrush of that vaster ocean of the infinite mind, and he calls the epoch a "high hour of visitation from the living God." When mind was rolling in billows, and filling up and gorging all the spaceless depths of the soul, was it not a burst of rhapsody to say that "thought was not, in enjoyment it expired?"

We have, here, an impressive illustration of the different points of view in which the poet and philosopher look at the same great facts in human experience, the one by side-lights and dissolving views, the other by a direct scientific analysis of the mental phenomena involved. Both speak with authority, and both are oracles to those who will take their positions respectively on the one or the other side. Both are right, only it is the poet that succeeds best in voicing the spontaneous judgments of the soul.

Emotion, Obscure Thought.—All emotion—according, perhaps, to the most reliable rumors coming in from noted explorers in a region that, for scientific adventure, must always be considered exceedingly dim and far—is in its last analysis *obscure thought*. Try it some time, when the rush of excitement is whirling you away. There is no paralysis of thought, though its sluice-gates are gorged, and the great deep of enjoyment is without form and void. And, therefore, it would be impossible, within the bounds of consciousness and discernible emotion—on the hither side of the absolute swoon—for thought to expire. The poet says that this open-sea view, in the morning hour, so rolled in upon his faculties, and whelmed them with a surfeit of joy, that he ceased to think. But then how could he say that he had ceased to think, when by supposition he was thinking enough to know that he was in joy? The overpowering emotion was one of joy; into this his thinking power sank; he thinks no more, but he continues to enjoy. Now, of course, he will not know that enjoyment lasts him, except in some act of conscious thought. Indeed we do greatly err if, in defining and classifying our mental processes—always a most difficult undertaking—we so set over thought against emotion, and emotion against thought, as to give place to the idea that in any phase of emotion whatever,

however intoxicating, there can be any real atrophy of thought. There cannot be. And Wordsworth in this famous passage of his, and elsewhere in similar passages out of his happiest moods, did not intend to be so understood.

Let us understand the method of the poets. We look to them as teachers, but never a dialectical appliance is found in their schools. The poet compasses all his high matter by proximate forms of speech, by metaphor, by symbol, by the subtle analogies of things, by exaggerations and contrarieties of conception, by intuitive hints, as moving in a region of ideas that can never be adequately expressed in words. The world of wonders lying out there on the watery deep, the morning sunburst coloring the clouds, the far sweep of the horizon with the sky and ocean blending in the purpling distance, the patent fact of an immensity of waters enswathing the globe—all this rush of sublimity has so given him glimpses of the Infinite that, for the moment, his thought seems to expire within him, and he seems to swoon in the delirium of his joy.

The truth is, the inner vision of his soul has been quickened to an overpowering perception of that which, in the ordinary estates of his consciousness, he could hardly see at all. The Infinite! yes, the Infinite, a term which the new-fangled wisdom of our day is wishing to see speedily dissipated into smoke—the Infinite, scarcely thinkable at all in our work-a-day moods, is in this "high hour" of poetic exaltation, poured into the mind with such affluence of glory, that words fail, and even thought seems correspondingly to die away.

"Break, break, break,
On thy cold gray stones O, sea,
And I would that my tongue could utter
The thoughts that arise in me."

But it cannot. At that moment Tennyson saw something, or perhaps in much larger measure felt something, in the breaking, the ceaseless breaking, of the incoming billows of the sea on the "cold gray stones," but he was a thoroughly baffled man, as we all must have been, when he came to put that something into words. "Thoughts" they were, but refusing to be plastic to the finest dexterity of his artistic skill; and the very confession

of his impotence was an out-burst of poetic tribute to the lofty character of the thoughts he would like to have expressed. He had, however, none the less a realization of the indeterminate mood of the moment, or what is better to say, as expressing the exact truth in the case, he had a season of "access of mind," a "high hour of visitation from the living God," which brought with it a vividness of realization not ordinarily enjoyed. We all have these seasons, gifted or not gifted, the dullest and most prosaic of us, as well as the most seraphic of the seers whose "eye pierces through the scum of things."

I have, perhaps, tarried longer than was necessary on this preliminary matter of the varying methods and apparently conflicting results of the metaphysician and the poet, when seeking to interpret those moments of intense spiritual excitement in which emotion swells to a consuming power in the soul. My aim was to get out of their consenting testimony the principle that our seasons of deepest feeling are really seasons of our deepest, though not possibly our most luminous, thought; that emotion is always struggling into articulate thought, and that it is barren and perishable, evanescent and vain, if it is not made at last to settle into some shape of fixed formula for the mind. I presume we cannot be striking wide of the mark, when we say that emotion in all its phases, even at the high-tide of orgasm and frenzy is of the nature of obscure, indetermined, inchoate thought; and what we want to emphasize now is, that it is a loss of energy, a futile, reckless squandering of spiritual forces, to catch it in this shape and let it go. We should institute an inquiry as to whether in the realm of spiritual experience there is not some *regime* of training for the emotions, whereby the deliberate purpose will be to hold on to them while they are with us, and to renew the occasion of them when gone, to the end that they may work themselves out into settled convictions of the mind.

Concreting emotion in act—Michael Angelo and Wordsworth.—

And, now, having found this principle in the province of the beautiful, where the well-springs of emotion are wont to break out ebullient and free, it were well to witness on the same field some practical illustrations of how this principle works. When Michael Angelo found that he had the task, of decorating the

Sistine Chapel on his hands, he shut himself up for days and weeks in his studio, refusing all access, and putting himself down to the meagerest supply of food. He was not sketching particularly; he was brooding over the scenes of awful grandeur which his imagination conjured for him from the ideal world. I suppose if we could have looked in upon his privacy in these hours of solitary musing, we should have seen him often in moods of great mental and physical agitation, the excitement rising betimes into paroxysms of frenzy. A wondrous panorama of epochal history and destiny has flashed out upon the empyrean of his soul, and his very frame is made to tremble under the awful splendor of the apocalypse. Creation has emerged from chaos, and the great years are rolling on with their burden of woe, and war, and prophecy, and redemption, and finally the Judge is on his throne, and the heavens are rolled together as a scroll, and out of the gloom the resurgent nations are coming to the great assize. Every face of the hurrying multitudes carries its history, and almost its doom, written legibly in the eye and along every lineament and muscular flexion—so vividly did the genius of Michael Angelo make the human body translucent to the mind.

But suppose, now, he had been satisfied to walk up and down in his chamber, seeing these awful visions of the Judgment, his eyes all on fire, and his whole frame quivering in Sibylline convulsions, of what profit would it have been? He would have had his seasons of transport, no doubt; but so might a lunatic go raving over the conjurings of his addled brain. Suppose that after these ecstatic visions he had gone down to the Sistine Chapel, and looked at its bald, blank, flaring walls, and turned away, and fled over the border, as more than once he did, of what profit would it have been to him or to the world, that his soul had been the theatre of these wondrous creative dreams? He would have the rapt emotions of the moment, no doubt, the luxury of excitement, the delirium that always goes with the free play of the "vision and faculty divine," but nothing of the tremendous glow of conviction in his own soul, and nothing of eternal truth fixed in imperishable fresco in the Sistine Chapel.

No! these evanescent emotions must be staid somewhere in

the solid substance of the globe. He must leave his solitary musings, go into the Sistine Chapel, erect a high scaffolding, and lie flat on his back for long hours at a stretch, as the days and months and years go by—for eight years was this miracle of art taking shape under his hand—fixing the recalled visions of his solitary chamber into the witchery of such lines and colors as only that mighty magician could devise. Then for him and for all the world, the "Vision of Judgment" was more than a dream.

Take another illustration from the experience of the poet who, more than any other, has set forth this high matter in his verse. It was Wordsworth's habit to wander over hill and valley, and by the glassy mere, and down into the beach glen, and here and there among old ruins, and among the cottages of the poor, for weeks and months together to catch nature in all her moods, and get some spiritual rendering for every object he saw. He was a wonderful master at this. He was nature's unchallenged high priest. "The burthen of the mystery, and all the weary weight of this unintelligible world" was often lightened and glorified for him by momentary flashes of—

"A presence that disturbed him with the joy
Of elevated thoughts; a sense sublime
Of something far more deeply interfused,
Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
And the round ocean, and the living air,
And the blue sky, and in the mind of man;
A motion and a spirit that impels
All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
And rolls through all things."

But suppose he had been satisfied with the luxury of being disturbed with the joy of elevated thoughts, with rapturous glimpses of that "something far more deeply interfused," and, coming back to his cottage by Grassmere, he had not attempted to recall his emotions and fix them indelibly in his immortal verse, he had not been the poet then, and his supreme faculty for insight would have died within him unused. Nay, more, since every high power of the human mind is retained and developed only in proportion as it is lifted from the realm of indeterminate emotion, and carried out on streams of voluntary effort into concrete communicable product in the world, there is no risk in say-

ing, that the mere luxury of poetic feeling must degenerate into surfeit, and the very faculty to enjoy become moribund, if the inspirations of the moment are not habitually coined into forms of art.

Religious Emotions follow the same Law.—And now we come to the realm of religion, and are already forestalled and expectant in witnessing the application of the same principle to the economy of spiritual life. More than any other matter of universal interest religion appeals to the emotions of the human soul. Researches in comparative religion have made it manifest that the religious susceptibility lies deepest in the nature of man, and that, in every clime and age, the stage of culture and development at which it has arrived will infallibly indicate the point in the scale of general uplifting to which the several peoples have attained. Religion leads all other civilizing forces. Everything in the social life of the nations turns as by magnetic traction to this centre. And if here and there in the history of religion, and here and there at this hour on the face of the earth, there are revolting excrescences, and barbarous crudities, and wild fanaticisms, and even sensual and bloody orgies, practiced in the name of religion, it is only an impressive token of the universality and supreme power of this impulse in the bosom of the race. For everywhere religion takes the soil of savagery on its fair robes, that it still may be the deliverer of savages from a stage of crude and foul humanity that else had been more hopelessly crude and foul.

This, however, we find to be the fact, that the religious impulse runs into wild and monstrous excesses only when arrested and detained in its emotional stage, or when the luxury of feeling is ignorantly or unwisely mistaken for the end toward which this impulse is directed. Here is the intoxication of a heavenly joy, why should we farther go? The splendors of the Transfiguration glories are bathing and swathing our souls, why should we withdraw from this mountain at all; why not get up a permanent habitation for our ecstasies, and here in this rarer and finer atmosphere drowse out our lives in delicious dreams? So the three disciples thought whom the glories of the transfigured

Jesus had dazzled and bewildered with excess of joy. But as if to indicate the special weakness of human nature when the strong currents of religious emotion were tiding in upon it, and with the view of setting up a standard, to which the eyes of all generations to come seeking after God might be directed, the Master forbade long tarrying on that mount, and cut short the supernal visitation with a gentle rebuke. There must be no building of tabernacles on that height. On the contrary they must go down with him into the vale below, where there was a poor lunatic waiting to be healed, and where their baffled companions had betrayed to the multitude a lack of resource.

The splendors, indeed, are to be witnessed; the ecstasy to be enjoyed. There must be some deep reason in the very nature of man, for this unwonted uplifting of the feeling when the inner mysteries of religion are approached. But out of it all must come a practical faith that will do the deed, before which the mountain will gather itself up and be plunged into the depth of the sea, or it is only a species of self-indulgence, and must speedily degenerate into spiritual debauch. These states of religious exaltation must never be an end. When so regarded, either by the crude and illiterate masses, who in all things are held to a struggling empiricism in their views, or by religious teachers whose system of thinking binds them to teach that doctrine to the masses—in all cases the attempt to absorb the religious life in the emotions, has been attended with untold disaster both to the teacher and the taught.

Special Lesson of the Transfiguration Ecstasies.—We are almost tempted to say, that the special design of the Transfiguration spectacle at the heart of the religion of Jesus, among other stupendous object-lessons which it threw upon the world, was to warn the coming ages of the one all-comprehensive error or practical blunder of the ethnical religions, that of putting emotional afflatus as their end and aim. Far off in the Orient, and down in Egypt, and in the caves and wildernesses of the very land in which the divine Son of Man was at that time sojourning, the leading minds and philosophers were sitting solitary, and wooing the "eternal silences," and hoping to be swept by some sort of oblivious rapture up into blissful absorption with

the divine. Meantime the groping people were as sheep without a shepherd, and religion was becoming a dream. The Master going down from Tabor teaches the lesson, that the most exalted frames of spiritual uplifting must effervesce in delusion, if not henceforth, immediately, concreted into work.

And that this admonition was to be of prime moment in his system, is made clear by what we may call the public policy of our Lord in managing the excited multitudes that thronged upon his path. He never "got up an excitement" as many of our crude emotional methods are wont to do. Whenever through witnessing some stupendous miracle, or hearing some sublime utterance from his lips, the tide of popular feeling would rush impetuously toward him, he would quell it or perhaps more frequently, withdraw himself entirely from their view. Nor will it do to say that this was only his customary precaution against the inconvenience of a throng. When the crowd was not on him, and some great miracle had been privately performed, he would send out the rejoicing subject, how often, with the special injunction that he should "tell no man." The enthusiastic multitudes rush toward him, eager to fling themselves into a vortex of precipitate belief, but just then, we are told, he "would not commit himself unto them, because he knew what was in man." Yes! he knew the spiritual organization of the race he came to save, the law of their emotional nature, and how at any time they could be easily marshalled into a carnival of feeling, and let loose in Bacchanalian profanation of the very sanctities he was here to reclaim.

Nor was the loud hosanna day of the Triumphal Entry an exception to this rule. Here was a special occasion to have its significance, then and there, on the eve of the great tragedy, which, in a few days thereafter, was to witness the same fickle multitude shouting the other way. It was rather a concession, by way of confounding, beforehand, the sophistry of the priesthood, who expected to find in the popular clamor a justification of their wicked deed. Moreover it was a formal entry—the fulfillment of prophecy—a demonstration made in the eyes of the Jewish state, and of all the world, that he who came riding into their capital city with the usual trappings of royalty, was a

real King, and did hereby set up in his own name. That purpose accomplished, he withdraws himself to Olivet or to that sweet Lazarus family whence he came.

Emotional Methods Prodigal of Spiritual Force.—But, now, here is a question eager to be asked. If the overflow of religious emotion was discountenanced by our Lord, or, rather, if his ministry was so ordered as to prevent the uninstructed multitudes from mistaking the overflow of their religious feelings for the spiritual life he came to confer; and if in his own personal bearing—never subject, so far as we know, to a delirium of joy, and always carrying his mountain ecstasies down into the region of self-sacrificing and beneficent deed—and if in his management of the masses that daily hung upon his words, he made this principle prominent and conspicuous for all coming time, how comes it that emotional methods have had such a widespread and protracted ascendancy in the Christian Church? They certainly have had a long sweep through the centuries, and to-day constitute the active principle of the various systems of evangelism that have had such phenomenal success in Christian lands, and outside of pastoral ranks. The results of their labors cannot have been wholly bad; nay, it is, perhaps, unfair to say that their labors in any case, where the evangelist was clearly and overtly a man of God, and well equipped with the "mind that was in Christ," were in any sense chargeable with evil results. For such is the inherent power of the truth, and especially of the image of Jesus when once it has thrown itself in definite outline upon the soul, that it will work its way into ultimate and permanent lodgment in the life, in spite of the unhappy method in which it is commended to men.

Meantime there is every bad risk, and an enormous loss of spiritual force in the method at fault. Fanaticisms get their opportunity to thrive, and great and disastrous reactions hurl backward the unstable convert into extremes of moral recklessness of which he would not otherwise have dreamed. Christianity, of course, has an endogenous power capable of putting forth its saving efficacy against all the errors, and false systems, and superstitions, and blundering methods, and apostasies, into which the ecclesiastical leaders may fall; and when we review the past,

and see how much of this has been sloughed off in its triumphing ascent—the innumerable spawn of heresies, and an ever-shifting brood of fanatical conceits—we are simply gathering up the irrefutable historical evidence of the divinity of the religion we profess in that it was able to survive all these.

Is it not time, however, that we turn our attention to some of the deeper problems in the economy of spiritual life, in order to determine whether our methods may not be as direct, and as conserving of spiritual force, as were the Master's own, and whether we cannot imitate him in his supreme regard for the laws of the human mind? Or do we err in suggesting the idea of economy in matters in which no human economy can avail—an unspiritual term implying a disposition to tamper with the details of an experience into the which the sovereign Spirit of God alone may intrude?

Scholastic finesse—"Stock and Stone Theology".—Perhaps, if we look deep enough, we shall find these false methods securely entrenched in the notion that, in sacred matters, we have nothing to do with the emotions of other men, or our own, for that matter; that there is the exclusive province of the Spirit of God. When the truth is preached, the Spirit of God moves upon the emotions of the hearer, and undertakes a work upon his nature in which no human being can share. This office he will discharge as seemeth him good. The divine operation for the renewal of man's nature goes on of itself. It drops down from above. And, therefore, all oversight of the religious emotions of men by any other than the Spirit of God and the individual soul in which they arise, is a priestly impertinence which the Christian system will not allow.

Unhappily those who make this retort are uniformly most industrious, and often not very wise in appealing to, and stirring up, the emotions of men. Their questionable methods are backed up by a theory that would allow of no method at all—that is, when carried out to its logical extreme. When Christendom waked up from the darkness of the Middle Ages, it seemed everywhere to draw inspiration for its reviving energies from the system of thinking which the great Augustine had thrown upon the world—a system most commending itself to the needs of

the Reformers, because it emphasized the spiritual impotence of man, and magnified greatly the sovereign mercy of God. Man was nothing. God was all. Out of this Calvinism grew as a twig out of the parent stock.

It was natural in those days—the exigencies of Christian evangelism seemed to require it—that extreme and exaggerated views both of the spiritual impotence of man, and of the sovereign mercy of God, be taken, in order to break abruptly with the monstrous forms of Pharisaism which for centuries had been brooding like a nightmare on the vitals of the Church. Accordingly it was the “stock and stone theology” which they found it best to espouse, the system that teaches that, in spiritual matters, the natural man is completely and literally dead, dead as a stock, or a stone, or as the pillar of salt into which Lot’s wife was turned.

The learned doctors of the Form of Concord, in expounding the Creed, assert in the most emphatic way, by synonyms and pleonastic forms of intensified expression, that man is so disabled under sin that he cannot even co-operate with the divine Spirit when it comes to dispense its saving grace to the soul—“utterly incapable of understanding, believing, embracing, thinking, willing, beginning, finishing, acting, operating, or co-operating in any respect,” not able “to prepare himself to receive the grace of God, or apprehend it when offered him, or accommodate himself and of himself be capable of accepting it, or contribute, act, operate, or co-operate, of himself, by his own power, in any respect toward his conversion, either wholly, partly, or in the smallest degree.” “Man is industrious and ingenious in civil and natural things, but in things spiritual and divine, which relate to the salvation of his soul, he is like a stock, a stone, or the pillar of salt into which Lot’s wife was turned, which have no use either of eyes, of mouth, or of any other senses.”* Language like this is in no danger of being misun-

*Formula Concordiae, Latin edition of Leipsic, Part 2d, Chap. 2d. *De Libero Arbitrio*, secs. 7, 20, 24. These extreme sentiments attributed by the learned doctors in Sec. 20 to Martin Luther in his Commentary on the 90th Psalm, were hardly his in any rigidly dogmatic sense, but were rather his way of expressing with strong rhetorical emphasis

derstood. The disability is complete. But for fear the inference might be too sweeping, and the non-elect sinner might have just occasion to blame the Spirit of God that its saving visitation was never extended to him, these learned doctors do concede to man the single responsible power of "locomotion" whereby he can get to church, and hear the gospel preached to him, and "*in some measure meditate on what he hears.*" But soon thereafter this generous concession is also withdrawn, and the man in the church, hearing the glad news of salvation preached to him, "is worse than a stock or a stone" because it is in his nature when he hears to oppose.

Christendom consents to something more than "locomotion."—Now it is safe to say that the views of all christendom have undergone a vast and radical change, on this vital subject of the power of man to coöperate with the divine Spirit in the renewing of his mind, without breaking with the general *consensus* of doctrine as to man's impotence in spiritual things, and the free mercy of God. Man must have the divine interposition to lift him out of sin. The incarnation, and atonement, and the reign of the divine Spirit—all mean this, or most certainly they have no meaning at all. I cannot get back to God without the help of God, and my sin consists in severance from him, in deliberately ordering my life on what I conceive to be my own resource. I must come at last in my penitence to say, and see, that I have no resource, that the divine life is born into the soul of man in proportion as the life of self is exorcised, and in proportion as, in active life, I am empowered to renounce everything to God.

Every step in this process invites and demands the most vigorous and persistent coöperation of man, and he must go about dislodging the isolating self in exactly the same way that he would dislodge any other offensive habit from the mind. We have come to see that there is a dormant religious nature in every man, and that all the appliances of a supernatural religion, gospel, sacrament, prayer, promise, and above all the ministra-

his deep conviction of man's disability under sin. Certainly the whole exposition *De Libero Arbitrio* as given by the Concord theologians, has never had a pronounced following in the churches bearing the great Reformer's name.

tion of the Spirit, or, as we would greatly prefer putting it, the pervasive presence of the glorified Master himself—all are but solicitations, and provocations, to the implicit spiritual potentiality of the soul, which, meantime, is lying there inert and blurred under the blight of sin. The preacher joins his agency to the other incitements, but none of them, divine or human, will ever move the man one peg from his inertia, until he undertakes heroically, and with deliberate forethought, for himself.

The Ascetic Conception of the New Life passing away.—In these days, as concerns this most serious of all matters that can engage the minds of men, it has been found best to set all the old-time scholastic *caveats* aside, and go at it in the light of common sense. If a man will get out of sin, he must proceed to get out of it, and not stop to chaffer about the degree of his disability under it. Gradually the ascetic conception of the new life, which houses it up to certain special experiences, and limits it to paroxysmal seasons of exalted devotional fruition, has given way, and men think, if they do not say, that the divine forgiveness is executed for them, only when they have had the fortitude, by the help of the Master, to cut loose from their sins.

And this common-sense view of salvation must in the end greatly modify, and, perhaps, wholly revolutionize the methods by which the Church seeks to evangelize the world. If the power of "locomotion" is all the responsible power that is left to the man, "whereby he can move his members" and get to church, the inference is that the Holy Ghost will let in upon him then, or through the truth which he hears there, an *afflatus* of feeling which is essentially not his own, in which he is held to be "passive," and in which, finally, is embodied the whole renewing epoch to which he is called. Now this makes the emotional moment the sum of all his years. We have already learned that in the field of the beautiful, emotion counts for nothing unless it is concreted in act. The painter must take hold of his brush, and the poet of his pen.

It is true no one would claim a supernatural element in the inspiration of the poet; or in the frenzy of the artist conjuring imaginary beings from an excited brain. The process is all human. Michael Angelo and Wordsworth were left wholly to

their native resource. But in the religion of Jesus we do all know that there is a distinctively supernatural element, and that this pervades its entire history, and sweeps through the entire circuit of the agencies it employs. Is not the Holy Spirit a supernatural agency, and shall he, in his sovereign efficiency, want the co-ordinating feebleness of the prostrate and corrupt will of man to do a work for him which he alone can do? Nay, verily! but then that sort of reasoning would exonerate the sinner, and put the whole responsibility of his ruin upon the Holy Spirit who did not come to his relief.

The truth is, a man's emotions, springing up anywhere, and on occasion of any class of subjects or objects presented to his view, are his own, and get their peculiar character, religious or otherwise, from the vague sentiment that floats about pervasively on the heaving deep. If the objects are beautiful, the aesthetic emotions will be aroused. If it is the touching picture of the self-sacrificing and suffering Son of Man, the passion and compassion of the cross; great power falling in beneficent miracle from hands that were afterwards nailed to the accursed tree; going into the very shrine of our terrors and feeling the powers of darkness wherever they reign; coming up a radiant figure all compassed about with the attempered splendors of the resurrection morn, and in this shape present everywhere with those who will give him place in their souls—before such a picture it were a hard heart indeed that would not give the religious emotions vent.

But the same law prevails here as elsewhere—let us call it a spiritual law in the natural world*—the vague sentiment of the

*See "*Natural Law in the Spiritual World*," Chapter on *Biogenesis*, where these words occur: "Not only in his relation to the spiritual man, but to the whole spiritual world, the natural man is regarded as *dead*. He is as a crystal to an organism. The natural world is to the spiritual as the inorganic to the organic." And that the insemination of spiritual life into the dead soul might not be held simply by way of analogy, the author proceeds to say: "We find one great law guarding the thresholds of both worlds, securing that entrance from a lower sphere shall only take place by a direct regenerating act, and that emanating from the world next in order above. * * * The analogy

emotions must articulate itself into fixed principles for the life, or otherwise these exalted experiences are as evanescent as the morning cloud. It is the truth, and not the emotions, that sets the man free—the truth wrought into perception by being wrought into the very life-blood and palpitating tissue of the soul. The man must go down from the mount, and demonstrate for himself that the well-springs of divine love are coursing through his veins, or else they are not coursing through his veins, no matter how exalted or how genuine his devotional ecstasies might have been. The emotions themselves, the mere paroxysm of elevated feeling, aroused though it be by the Holy Spirit himself, can no more constitute a new spiritual product for the soul, than the dim and flitting vision of Hamlet could constitute for Shakespeare the marvelous, artistic masterpiece of the play itself. For any spiritual movement whatever to be even begun in the soul, the voluntary powers must be engaged, and the man must have gone a-warring, under the lead of the Master, with the evils of his life.

Making Converts "by the Book of Arithmetic"—Polling-Booths.—Now the emotional methods of which we complain reckon up the finished product always within some boundary, more or less contracted, of the emotional domain. They cannot wait for the operation of our Lord's time-gauge: "If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed." They must make converts by "the book of arithmetic," and before closing the numbers must be enrolled. Their one forlorn remnant of spiritual capacity, "locomotion," has carried the multitudes to

therefore, is only among the phenomena; between laws there is no analogy—there is continuity." There is in this a most unwarranted misconstruing of the natural man. The natural man is still in some sense a free spirit, and the law of the spirit is freedom, while the law of the natural world is necessity; and to speak of any natural law running into the realm of spirit by "continuity" is a most unpardonable solecism, and vitiates the whole argument of this otherwise brilliant and suggestive book. The title of the book might better be reversed, and then it would be "Spiritual Law in the Natural world" not by continuity, but by superposition. Even then the natural man as being himself in the realm of spirit could not be represented as subject to the "absolute regenerative act." What a contribution to Calvinism it would be, to mount it on the back of physical law.

church, or to some vast tent or tabernacle, where thousands are congregated, where the crowd itself, and the preaching, and the prayers, and above all the singing, are calculated to excite the mind, and withal to awaken a ferment of genuine religious zeal. The leaders have made provision for this beforehand, and never once doubted their right or ability to co-ordinate the divine Spirit in its movements on the hearts of men. And so far they were certainly not at fault. But in their haste to roll up formidable numbers, and swell the spectacular aspect of the work they do, they put up polling booths in their assemblies, and invite and press men to vote on their spiritual state. The new-born, having been taught that spiritual life is wasted in upon them as on gales from the heavenly world, are required to note the moment of its advent, and when their joy is most assuring, get up and give that glad testimony to the world. They thus vote themselves into the kingdom, and are forthwith enrolled.

Now the entire sincerity of all this it were wicked to deny, and rude would be the hand that should ever be stretched forth to quench the smoking flax. But it is a gravely serious matter, that these methods, representing as they do the practical operation of refined scholastic distinctions concerning the inscrutable movements of the divine Spirit, and the earlier phases of Christian experience, fast passing out of vogue, are in contravention of the well-ascertained laws of man's emotional nature, and clearly not in accord with the methods of the divine Master himself.

Our Lord's Method, what was that?—That these methods were not the Lord's method, any one may demonstrate for himself, by allowing the wondrous years of our Lord's public ministry to pass in panoramic view before him, recalling, meantime, the distinctly enunciated maxims which guided him in his work. He had the curious multitudes always on his track—the masses, indeed, in the most motly and bedraggled sense of that term. The poor—yes, truly, the poor had the Gospel preached to them; lazzaroni, the wretched, the diseased, the dying, all phases of depraved and broken humanity, kept time with the wandering footsteps of the Master, and caught the touch of his miracle, and heard the sweet tones of his forgiving love. He preached to

them everywhere as best he could, but obviously it was not the multitude as multitude that he sought, as the soil on which his saving truth was to be cast. He had compassion on the multitude—not because they were there in ready attitude to receive his compassion, but because they were as sheep without a shepherd, scattered abroad.

He invited them all to come unto him; he would cast no one out. But when, through the stress of excitement, they were disposed to rush into precipitate and over-sanguine belief, he withdrew himself from them, or put their enthusiasm in check by reminding them, that the kingdom of heaven was like a grain of wheat which a man cast into the ground, which grew he knew not how, first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear. The time-gauge he kept repeating: "If ye continue in my word then are ye my disciples indeed"—continuance, when they had gone away from the prevailing charms of his person, and the sweet compulsion of his words, when the sentiment that had inspired them had fallen from its height of emotional fervor to the dull common-place of the market and the street.

When one thinks of it, it is remarkable how much of his instruction has this direct practical drift—a continual admonition that nothing of his inexhaustible spiritual largess can ever in any way be appropriated by man, except in so far as it is wrestled into the life. The kingdom he brought with him was a pre-eminently practical matter, and every man thinking to enter it, should sit down composedly and count the cost. And then there is that memorable Sermon on the Mount filled with precepts, and beatitudes, and heavenly counsel, every syllable of which implies that the true disciple is one who conquers his assurance among the hard utilities of life, and discovers the grace of Jesus in him in his growing power to love his enemies, and to do unto others as he would have them do unto him.* As if to put us

*See Count Tolstoi's "My Religion." This great Russian romancer and reformer claims the distinction of having discovered now for the first time, after these long ages of groping exegesis, the true meaning of the Sermon on the Mount, as being a detailed statement of the laws of the new kingdom of Jesus, condensed in the one comprehensive in-

beyond all doubt on this matter, that wonderful discourse comes to its peroration with the distinct announcement, that whosoever would give heed to his words, and *do them*, was like the wise man that built his house on a rock—his attainments were solid; while he who heard, and *did not*, was like the foolish man that built his house on the sand. The same thing is in the parable of the sower and the seed; in the parable of the laborers; in his great canon of inquiry: "Whosoever doeth the will of the Father shall know of the doctrine;" and, "Whoso doeth the truth cometh to the light."

Absence of all Conventionalism.—Accordingly when Jesus moves among the multitudes, we fail to find one element of conventional evangelism in all he does. He puts no number of them down to bemoaning their sins through a season of contrition, long or short, but rather aims to catch the estranged spirit at some point of its physical distresses, and having shed his beneficent miracle there, sends it out rejoicing with the warning, "Go thy way and sin no more, lest a worse thing come upon thee." He carries no roll-book with him, in which the names of the converts might be entered, and they are not induced to stand out in the great assembly and make themselves known. That would be ostentation, the very opposite of the spirit of self-renunciation with which this new spiritual life must begin. He had taught in the most explicit manner in the Sermon on the Mount, that his religion would not consent to be set off in any form of personal or ritualistic show, that whenever it should become spectacular it would cease to be. The rejoicing subject of his miraculous healing was dismissed from his presence, with the added boon of the forgiveness of his sins, but with his in-

junction, "Resist not evil," with four or five special applications, inhibiting divorce under any circumstances, and oath-taking, and courts of justice, and every form of reacting against evil, and requiring the actual and complete renunciation of the personal life or self to the good of others. His discovery is set forth with all the ardor of a zealot, and with startling literal enforcement of passages which we were wont to play upon with our constructive ingenuity. In the midst of its extravagancies and forced renderings this strange book conveys a message to the Church of our day which it may well consent to hear patiently and consider.

dex-finger laid upon his lips. Be still; do not bruit this thing abroad; for whenever you feel yourself craving the eye of your fellow-men it is the return of the banished demon of self in another form.

Religion on Exhibition Dies.—If there was one doctrine which our Lord made paramount to every other, and to which he made every movement of his public ministry conform, it was this, that religion takes tarnish from deliberate exposure to public view. Its quality was to be known in act, in the humblest offices of every-day life, and farther than this the principle was to be, that the left hand should not know what the right hand did.

Hence the skill with which our Lord held back these multitudes, when the incitements to rush into a frenzy were the most extraordinary that ever greeted the eye of men. His miraculous power alone!—what an advertisement that would have been. He might have erected a stage on the Mount of Olives, at the point where the great thoroughfares converge from all climes to the Holy City, and over which the commerce and travel of the world was surging, and from that high theatre he might have exhibited to the gaping curious spectators, such displays of miraculous healing, thousand times repeated, as no one would ever have attempted to gainsay. But he came not to bring miracle, but religion into the world, and religion withers in the atmosphere of public display. The divine fingers, touching human woe at any point, must ray out in miracle, and miracle, by the very nature of it, must become a spectacle to men; but even here, that it might be held back as much as possible from shedding a contaminating influence on the religion it was meant to subserve, the charge to the rejoicing subject was that he should "tell no man."

O, how the Church in after years forgot this paramount teaching of our Lord. Show! why yes, let us have a show. Let us turn these humble offices of the shrinking Nazarene into a vast and imposing system of ecclesiastical pageantry and parade, that honor-loving priests and preachers may have a chance to be seen, and, mayhaps, the gratification of seeing the masses coming and worshipping at their feet. O, those long ages of ec-

clesiasticism! what are they but ages of religious apostasy and spiritual decline? There were lowly ones in those days, indeed, men and women down in the humble walks of life, who somehow inherited the secret of self-renunciation, as not only at the heart of the religion of Jesus, but as essentially the whole of it, and through these, and not through the ostentatious, self-asserting, conspicuous ones, has the historical continuity of the Master's spirit been kept up. They learned of him to be meek and lowly of heart, and they found rest for their souls.

But the point we wish to emphasize now is, that this is the sensitive, vital spot in the religion of Jesus, and that it is evermore in danger of being profaned. Especially in these days of the competition of the sects is our Lord's method, or this vital point in it, likely to be overlooked, and even the distinctive reality of it haughtily scouted and denied.

Our Lord's Method—was it a Type?—It will be said that our Lord's method is no type for the evangelism of these times. He had infinite measures of supernatural resource immediately at his command; we have not. He was divine, and therefore did not require a system of decoy expedients as "a fisher of men," whereby to catch their attention, and help into action their hesitating wills. We are not so equipped. We must fling out our advertisements, and encourage the faltering resolution of the penitent, by some forward public commitment that will secure them for the gospel net. Our Lord could well dispense with all the minuter appliances and organized agencies of modern evangelism, when to his miraculous healing was added such preaching as can never fall from the lips of mortal man.

Moreover, it is urged, these were days of preparation; it was no time to number the host; on the day of Pentecost the first human evangelists will roll up their full three thousand. Jesus was sowing the seed, the time of harvesting came when, on that memorable occasion of the outpouring of the Spirit, Peter and his associates drew in the first gospel draught. Here then was the type in accordance with which our modern system of evangelism has taken shape.

And then again it is urged that with Jesus the apparatus of completed redemption was not yet on hand. He was on his

way to provide it, but it will not be fully consummated until he is crucified and risen again, and out on his spiritual reign. Jesus was, therefore, not properly an evangelist; he was not engaged in saving men, but in getting the moral universe of God in such condition as that men might be saved. His public ministry, for this reason, it is argued, cannot be fairly included in the category of evangelizing agencies, and is otherwise too divinely exalted to be a model for the necessarily varied and ever shifting methods of men.

This looks indeed plausible, but it is evidently going too far. Could it be that the great Redeemer himself should be limited and confined in the exercise of his saving power, by technical processes which he himself was carrying out? Can he not save, who is preparing the way to save? It is hardly possible to conceive of anything so alien to the whole purport of Christ's teaching, and equally so to his practice, as the notion of his saving men by anticipative reference to atoning provisions not yet made. No doubt he is making an atonement, but the atoning power and personality are all there when Jesus touches the blind man's eyes into seeing, and pardons his sins. On countless occasions he performs this supreme act of forgiving men their sins—a thing that sounded like blasphemy to Jewish ears, as did also his calling himself one with the Father. Beyond question all such assumptions imply the fullness of the divine investiture, and, therefore, plenary deific power to do for the poor paralytic, then and there, spiritually, all that the preparations of the coming time would insure, viz. pardoning his sins, and giving to him eternal life.

Special Experiences were never a Test.—But the thing to be observed is, that he does not at any time make special experiences a test. We seek in vain for an instance. And this is so marked a feature of his ministry, which is otherwise so set round with safe-guards in this respect, that it is matter of wonder that this salient particular has not more frequently thrust itself upon our view. We must have noticed that many wretched victims of disease are brought to Jesus, with no higher motive, so far as appears in the narrative, than to have their physical maladies healed, and that he uniformly goes beyond the sordid limits of

their expectation, and imparts to them some measure of his spiritual life. The pardon of sins—what does that mean for one who came not asking it, but asking only that his blind eyes should see, or his deaf ears be unstopped? Of course, it is not even hinted that there was no susceptibility in these victims for the spiritual benefits our Lord would impart; that would contradict the whole moral order of the world, and would be directly in conflict with the rule in accordance with which the divine Healer proceeded—"He did not many mighty works there, because of their unbelief." But what we mean to say is, that the chief and absorbing matter in the minds of these victims, was the desire to be cured of their diseases, and saved from impending physical death. The interests of their souls figured almost not at all. But having accepted the great Healer for what of divine power an unmistakable miracle must always imply, they furnished, in this meagre, scant, almost unconscious susceptibility, a seed-plot large enough, in our Lord's estimate, to receive the deposits of his spiritual life.

The case of the man sick of the palsy is a most remarkable circumstance as throwing light on this otherwise anomalous proceeding of our Lord. Four men, carrying the sick man, and being unable to get him into the house to Jesus, on account of the eager throng that was blocking every passage-way, mount with their charge to the top of the house, break up the roof, and through the opening let down the sick man on his couch immediately at the Master's feet. Here was an occasion; but, mark well, all for the purpose of having this sick man healed. Jesus, having a stupendous lesson to communicate, does not say what they expected him to say: "Sick man, arise, take up thy bed, and walk," but he simply says: Son, or child,—a term of endearment—thy sins are forgiven. There it was; that was all. During the momentous pause that follows, the charge of blasphemy is springing up in the hearts of the scribes, and they are reasoning upon the gravity of an offence when a humble man, here in a lowly Capernaum house, will openly take upon himself the prerogatives of God, for evidently God only has the power to forgive sins. The silence is at last broken by that

memorable challenge: "Whether is easier, to say to the sick of the palsy, Thy sins are forgiven; or to say, Arise, and take up thy bed, and walk? But that ye may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins, (he saith to the sick of the palsy) I say unto thee, Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thy house. And he arose, and straightway took up the bed, and went forth before them all.

Now there was here the forgiveness of sins, when evidently only a healing miracle was expected, and when the susceptibility for spiritual favor—what there was of it—was more inviting to our Lord in the four men on the roof, than in the sick man on his couch. Above all let us remember that this was the forgiveness of sins, the divine, authoritative forgiveness of sins, with all that that supreme act implies, for one in whom none of the conventional soul-struggles or coveted emotional upliftings were witnessed or required.

Place of Emotional Upliftings in the Economy of Spiritual Life.—But we hasten on, finally, to ask, what legitimate office there may be left for those emotional upliftings to discharge, seeing, now, that they must have some place in the economy of spiritual life. } They come to us, every one—these gales that sweep in upon us from the eternal world. I cannot think that in this great world of mankind there is any human being so low down in moral darkness and sin, as not to have wafted in upon him, now and then, some breath of impulse toward a higher life. God cannot so abandon his offspring as to leave them without some token, here and there vividly repeated, of his most loving, and most unwearied interest in them.

This Spirit of his—what after all is it, but the the same great Healer no longer hemmed in by the narrow and gross environment of "the little land and broken people" of Palestine, but out on the range of the universal moral world? Look all about you—lo! he is walking now, as ever, on all the highways of the earth; and whereas, formerly, he could not get to the multitudes nor the multitudes to him, for the very stress of the jostling mass, now the way is open for him to the myriad heart of humanity all at once. Having seen him in his incarnate ministry dispensing his beneficent miracle without stint, and always

overflowing the paltry measures of human desire, we delight to think that he is the same impartial munificent giver of gifts yesterday, to-day, and forever. Seeing him as we do, there comes over us a feeling of shivering revulsion, at the bare thought of his withholding his visitations from some of his creatures, and extending them to others. "Behold, I stand at the door and knock"—most undoubtedly, at one time or another, and in a profoundly real sense all the time, at the door of every human heart in the world. But reciprocation is to be evoked.

As a matter of universal experience, sometimes through incidental influences about us, the reading of a book, the recurrence of some touching memory, the timely utterance of some word fitly spoken, the stealing in upon the dull routine of our work-a-day struggle of an aroma of association, O how subtle! the mind is swept upward into an attitude of spiritual perception and emotion much like that "diviner air" in which we conceive the angels to live. For the time being all selfish and sensual impulses are overpowered and estranged. We seem to be lifted above all the low-mind sordid passions that are wont to rule us in the flesh, and to have actually gained foot-hold in the higher life. But we know that in a brief time the flood-tide of spiritual emotion will subside, and that the mere opening of our door to the street will dissipate the vision into the light of common day.

What then? Were we deceived? Were these the mere caprices of a wearied brain, the reactionary moods of a soul for a long time depressed, and turning to fairer skies, because the gloomy skies cannot always overhang—the inevitable rise and fall of the temperature of the mind? No, by supposition our exalted feeling was in the direction of God, of Jesus, and the play of our spontaneous emotion was all around him. Our mood is a spiritual one, for in it spiritual things, which are wont to be so utterly dull and opaque, become all luminous, and for the moment overpoweringly attractive and real. Sensuous things dwindle in importance, and the world's all-engrossing pleasures and pursuits are robbed of their charm.

Not Seasons of Probation, but Preparations for Probation.—Now what we desire to say, and say again, with O how much

earnestness, is that these moods of elevated feelings, though genuinely spiritual, and coming, no doubt, under the timely ministrations of the Spirit of God, are not seasons of probation, and should not be so represented.* There is no trial there, no crisis, and therefore nothing to be attained. If they were seasons of probation, then the soul should take fast hold of the rapt experiences of the moment, and risk its destiny in not letting them go. But go they must, and then with their subsidence the hour and article of probation comes fiercely on. The world now resumes its seductive charms, while on the other hand the spontaneous joy of yesterday's visitation has quite faded out and gone. On this arena the man is put to the test, and here only is it possible for him to attain. Human freedom must move in the atmosphere of moral equilibrium, or it is not human freedom at all; and it is inconceivable how, in any other situation, the soul of man could ever count on a single moral quality as its own. All God's spiritual gifts are deposited with us in that condition of spirit which the furnaces of probation have refined. But probation is one man pulled equally between two men equally strong, with the power of yielding his preponderance in whichever direction he may see fit.

*See article in the *British Quarterly Review*, vol. 80, p. 389, on Dr. Wm. Geo. Ward's *Essays on the Philosophy of Theism*. I quote from pp. 409-10. "There are times when, either by the immediate action of the Father within us, or under the influence of an inspired book, or an inspired teacher, we are as it were borne on by the power of spiritual ideas and emotions, the sense of God's presence and the conscious experience of his love overpowering for a time all selfish and sensual ideas. * * * Such blessed experiences are not, however, seasons of probation; they are seasons of preparation for probation. But when the flood-tide of spiritual emotion ebbs, as ebb it will, and the world's attractions resume their seductive power, then arises the critical moment, when man is called upon by the categorical imperative within him to do the right, not because it is predominantly pleasurable, not because, as yesterday, when actuated and impelled by the strong glow of devotion, the spontaneity of his being pressed in that direction, but simply because it is what his higher nature prompts, and what he feels that God approves." Here comes in what Mr. Ward designates the "anti-impulsive effort" of the soul against the "vehement urgency of worldly desire" and in the direction of God's drawings.

Now, yesterday's high hour of rapt emotion cannot go with this man down the mount and out into the street, but it leaves upon his mind a powerful conviction of the reality of his higher nature, and of the inviolable claim it has on him. The truth that floated yesterday before him as a vague sentiment, dazed and dashed by the sun-bursts of his feeling, to-day lies heavily on him, even as if it were the hand of God. On the other hand lies "the vehement urgency of worldly desire," which he has fostered until it has appropriated the larger portion of himself; and between these two forces his free spirit is suspended, and his destiny in the end will be certainly determined by the direction in which he yields himself to obey.

It will be seen, then, that these favored moments of spiritual uplifting involve no crisis, and cannot work out any finished product for the human soul. This is attained only through the fierce refinings of probationary burnings, or in the actual struggle, when the soul, by a strong "anti-impulsive effort," throws itself against the desperate persistency of worldly desire, and in the direction of the divine drawings, the impress of which it carries with it from yesterday's season on the mount. Are these emotional upliftings therefore to be set aside and ignored, as having no rightful place in a well-ordered system of evangelism, honestly planned under God for the saving of men's souls? All that we can say in answer to this is, that they are not seasons of probation, and cannot be, and that it is a serious and grave error to teach men to hope that their spiritual life must begin and end in them.

Gospel of the Two Mountains.—How much of this is done in the current methods of evangelism, it boots us not to say, but there is obviously some cause for the disastrous shrinkage in ethical product from the loudly bruted trophies of the most successful of these campaigns. And the word is gone abroad that the churches of our time have strangely travestied the sublime ethics of the gospel, or, otherwise, have given over the practical features of Christianity for the brief and fitful transports of an ascetic's dream. We are taunted with the charge of having lost the gospel of the one mountain—highly ethical, practical, with strong divine nerve for the heroic uses and sacrifices of

life,—and taken up with the gospel of the other mountain, that whereon the swooning Peter wanted to live his life away rapt in the elysium of a supersensible bliss. Alas! there is a visible lack of those active virtues which the Master put down at the very door of his kingdom, in his great opening Sermon on the Mount,—lack, in those very ones who go forth as the emissaries of the King, teaching, and believing doubtless, that he gave those hard conditions, such as loving one's enemies, letting our light shine before the world, sacrificing self, and keeping the golden rule, not because he wanted them obeyed, but specifically because they could not be obeyed, in order that we might blunder our way over them to spiritual life in him.

Accordingly the intensest forms of self-love are often found obtrusively flaunting their ugly colors closest round the altars of God, in those whose special function it is to preach the beautiful Jesus to the world, and live him in their lives. If there is one sad sight in the world, it is to see such a being, intrusted largely with the spiritual interests of his fellow men, and under solemn pledge to feed his Master's sheep, himself feeding on the dry and sapless garbage of his devotional frames. "How can ye believe which receive glory one of another?"—why, Master, there are those in our day, claiming very prominent places in thy Kingdom, sitting as they imagine on thy right hand and on thy left, who betray incessant craving for the glory of men, and do not dream that this can incapacitate them to believe. Do they not believe when they throw themselves in devotional ardor upon their knees, and talk much and piously of thee? Like the political prelates of old, they import the maxims of the world into the counsels of the church, and in the name of the dear Lord aspire to the chief places of power, and on their way thither ride over every commonest principle of honesty and right. Still they think they believe, for can they not recall the very day and hour when, in the glow of devotion, their whole soul was rapt away in the ecstasy of belief? yet here is the unequivocal teaching of Jesus, that the lust of dominion, and the desire for the glory of men, which in these days of declining spirituality rages like a forest-fire in the churches, turns every vigorous growth in God's garden into the charred stumps of a

wilderness, and eats up and consumes every green thing in the soul. This lust of rule is hell, and how can it be harbored in the churches without turning them into Babylon, or, perhaps, more properly, into that gorgeous colosseum of Mulciber, Milton's Pandemonium, wherein the worshipers are transformed into serpents which go hissing and writhing against the government of God.

The lesson to be enforced is that there is no genuine spiritual life, nor can be, where the love of self is supreme, and that devotional ardors will not burn this defilement out of the soul; the furnaces of probation, kindled of course by the Spirit of God, can alone do this work. And yet in all this it were a short-minded philosophy, and an utterly barren system of evangelism, that would make no reckoning of the high offices of these frequent upliftings of the carnal mind. They come at the divine solicitation of the brooding Son of Man. They are there with no less an import than to give stimulus, and prepare opportunity for the aspiring soul to go into the heat of the contest, and work out its salvation under the light of convictions which its transient ecstasy has thrown all around the sky. But for these, there were no probation possible, because the man in his reason of spiritual uplifting caught glimpses of a higher nature in himself, and had vivid intuitions of the dying love, and the sweet, all-conquering compassion, of the glorified Son of Man. They have put the weapon into his hand, a sharp two-edged sword, with which to deal effective blows, when the time of close-quarters has come for him with the usurping evils of his life, and they have given him a fortitude, and the inbreathings of a generous hope, that, despite his utter wretchedness and sin, he may fight his way out into the light and liberty of the sons of God. And so it would be an error as fatal to all successful ministration in behalf of souls, to overlook these emotions, or give them no organic place in the economy of spiritual life, as it would be to make them all in all.

Reaction of Formalism—Rich Man's Church.—Alas! this again we are compelled to witness—a cold, dry, formal intellectualism, or a tawdry aestheticism, coming up from a violent reaction against the swarming fanaticisms into which mere emo-

tionalism runs. Men build stately churches, and adorn them with rich and gorgeous trappings, and avail themselves of costly appointments, and worship with decorum under the gloom and glory of a venerable ritual, and the far-back historic associations of an imposing ecclesiasticism, and they seem at peace as they go up and down the dim religious aisles, but there is no zeal for souls. O, what a glaring incongruity this is with what the wandering, suffering, self-sacrificing Nazarene planted down on our earth as the Church of his making, in which fishermen and the shepherdless poor were put into the highest place! Shame! shame! upon what unhappy times we have fallen, when the rich and refined must have a church all to themselves, and the poor in spirit are sent out to batten on the bleak common of the world! Look in upon the rich man's church, with its showy assemblies, its formal devotions, its delegated piety, its voice at the altar trimmed to suit the sensitive ear of powerful worldlings who have set up the establishment for their own entertainment and behest, under the awful misnomer of the church of the Redeemer of men, and then turn swiftly to the Nazarene with his motley audience on the slopes of Olivet, or among the fishermen's huts along the sea of Galilee—and mark the contrast. This stupendous religious farce is the phenomenon of our times—a reaction from the wild and revolting fanaticisms into which the untutored poor are wont to carry their religious frames.

Emotionalism and formalism! how these two religious excrescences embarrass the life of the church, and against them how inherently the spirit and method of the Master are in condign revolt. In the better day coming—let us hope, and labor, and pray for its speedy advent—the disciples of Jesus will not be kept asunder by irreconcilable differences of temperament, or method, or form, or creed, but will embrace each other on the highways of life as brethren, with pledges of mutual help and encouragement in the common work to which all are devoted, the supreme all-urgent, comprehensively inclusive effort to reproduce the divine image in tangible, visible realization in the life, and so be one in him, according as he pathetically supplicated in his dying prayer.

ARTICLE II.

THE TEMPTATION OF CHRIST AND HIS IMPECCABILITY.

By REV. J. HAWKINS, D. D., Haigler S. C.

A REAL TEMPTATION.

The account in Matt. 4 of the Temptation of Christ is the statement of a veritable historical fact that is to be accepted upon the same satisfactory basis of interpretation that governs us in the proper understanding of all other scripture.

The Tempter was the devil, whose existence and character are declared in scripture, and not a myth, or spectre, or influence, or suggestion prompted by anything within or without our Saviour. The person tempted was the Son of God and the Son of Man, the Lord Jesus Christ, the God-man, not his divinity apart from his humanity, nor his humanity apart from his divinity, but the Second Person of the adorable Trinity. The Temptation was an effort really and truly made by the devil to try, persuade, incite, or provoke Him to the commission of evil. The Temptation was not merely an occasion offered for Christ to prove either his unwillingness to sin, or his impeccability.

The account then, is to be received as the narrative of a real transaction that did actually occur at the time and place, and under the circumstances mentioned by the evangelists, and constitutes a part of the history of the life of our Lord upon earth.

It is not to be explained away as an allegory, a figure of speech, a parable, or any thing otherwise than a historical fact. And being an important fact in the history of a remarkable personage, and associated with and illustrative of one of the most interesting characters met with in history, it has left its indelible impress upon the world. It also involves principles and doctrines that materially affect the Revelation of God, and the salvation which it reveals.

To properly understand the nature, design, intent and extent

VOL. XX. No. 1.

of the Temptation, its effects upon Christ, and hence, upon his Church, and the Redemption for that Church which Christ was then working out, and the effect which it was intended to produce upon the tempted believers in Christ, is a matter of the first importance, and of special interest to every one who claims Christ as a Saviour.

WHAT WAS THE TEMPTATION?

There are different kinds of temptation. In Gen. 22, it is said that God tempted Abraham. The word is there and elsewhere understood to mean to try, to prove, and is not used in a bad sense, for "God cannot be tempted neither tempteth he any man." Nor was it an effort on God's part to find out what was in Abraham, for "he knows us altogether." The scriptures abound in instances and illustrations of God trying and proving the faith of his people. But in no instance can it be alleged that he infuses evil into the hearts of any whom he thus tries, or by any means of seduction inclines them to harbor or cherish thoughts contrary to his will.

In some passages of scripture men are said to tempt God. In Ex. 17, the Israelites are said to tempt, try, provoke the patience of God. In such cases, the motive which tempts God is evil, and the temptation is real, but ineffectual; for God cannot be tempted—successfully as man is tempted, *i. e.* cannot be tempted to do wrong.

Satan and bad men tempt both good and bad men to do wrong, when through word, deed or influence they endeavor to seduce them into acts of disobedience and sin. Sometimes such temptations are successful, at other times they are not, but the temptation is as real in one case as in the other. In this last mentioned sense Christ was tempted of the devil, and it should not be understood in any other sense. On the part of the devil the motive and design were evil. The temptation was an appeal to what he supposed to be a weakness in the human nature of Christ; and the temptation was real and Christ was as really tempted from without as those individuals are to whom St. James refers when he says: "Men are tempted when they are drawn away of their own lusts, and enticed;" but while the

temptation was as real, it did not have the same effect, for Christ was not "drawn away by lust nor enticed."

There is nothing immoral in being tempted. No wickedness attaches to man simply because he is tempted. The only sin for which he is answerable is that of not resisting. If he resists, he has committed no sin. "Every man is tempted, is guilty of becoming party to the temptation, and makes it a means of sinning, when "he is drawn away and enticed," so as to yield to the force of the temptation. Temptation is one thing, its effects quite another.

Nor is it necessary to suppose that there must be a weakness in the being tempted in order to constitute the effort to lead astray, or a temptation. Men are said to tempt God, and the word is used in a bad sense, and yet the temptation has no effect upon God, for he "cannot be tempted."

This will appear as we proceed to define

THE NATURE AND PERSON OF CHRIST.

Various theories in regard to the Temptation have prevailed as men have understood the Person of our Lord.

A correct view of his Person will lead to a correct understanding of the Temptation. The Person of Christ was different from all other men. We are constituted of body, soul and spirit, and these constitute our personality. Christ was constituted a Person when divinity was conjoined with body and soul. Christ was never simply body and soul, but always a divine Person consisting of divinity, soul and body. He had no taint of original sin, nor the impartation of Adam's sin. His human nature differed from Adam's before the fall, for it never existed apart from divinity. Our dogmaticians tell us that the union of soul and body did not constitute Christ a Person, as it did Adam, and, since the fall, all mankind.

"Christ was always a divine person, never a human person."

Canon Liddon says: "At his incarnation Christ took on him human nature, not a human personality." The great fault and heresy of *Nestorius* was that of attributing to Christ two personalities, human and divine. The alloësis of *Zwingle*, which *Luther* so justly condemns as the grand-child of *Dame Reason*,

partakes of this heresy, and presents such a Christ as Luther says he does not want as a Saviour, *Schmid* in his *Dogmatics*, page 316, says: "The person of the Redeemer is constituted when the *Logos*, the Second Person of the God-head, the Son of God, unites himself with human nature, and this so firmly and intimately that the united natures constitute one person, which is that of the Redeemer, the God-man." *Hollazius* says: "The result of this activity of the *Logos* is, that the hypostasis of the divine nature now has become the hypostasis of the human nature, *i. e.* both natures have now the same hypostasis, that of the *Logos*, and together form one person, that of the Redeemer, the God-man."

So, then from the time of the assumption of flesh and blood by our Lord, there has dwelt in Him "all the fullness of the God-head bodily." "It pleased God that in him should all fullness dwell;" fullness of personality, perfection of both natures, fullness of the God-head, fullness of grace, fullness of moral excellence, and fullness of power. All of this fullness dwelt in him from the assumption of our nature, and was used or withheld as occasion required; so that of himself he could do nothing, and yet he possessed all power in heaven and on earth. During the time it was withheld Satan could lead him into the wilderness, and when occasion called for it he could say, "Get thee behind me, Satan," and could have called twelve legions of angels to his assistance.

If it be said that the union of his two natures could not save him from suffering, how then could it save him from sinning, or the liability to sin?—we answer that suffering is not wrong, not inconsistent with his two natures. He could with those two natures suffer and make suffering *meritorious*, but he never could have made either sin, or ability to sin, or a desire to sin, consistent with his nature, nor meritorious in the work of man's salvation. The nature or Person of Christ, the nature of the work he came to perform, and the relations that he sustained both to the Father and to man all precluded the idea of failure, and all danger of any possibility of yielding to the temptation of the devil.

WAS CHRIST THEN IMPECCABLE?

God Himself has made some things impossible for himself. It is impossible for divinity to sin. The very nature of God, the divine constitution of the universe, the "eternal fitness of things," and all the principles of moral right, make it impossible for God to lie, to be imperfect, to sin. This is absolutely declared in God's word, and universally believed by intelligent men. It is impossible for God to fail in the execution of his plans. To fail is to be destitute of absolute power, and contradicts the Scriptures that assert that "all power belongs to God."

It was, then, impossible for the divinity in Christ to sin, for he and the father are one; but we cannot contemplate him, know him, understand him, apart from his human nature; nor can we speak intelligently of his human nature apart from the divine nature. Now, in contemplating such a being as Christ is, it is not necessary to attach the idea of weakness or imperfection to him, nor is it at all allowable for us to do so; for the moment we do so, we attach imperfection to God, for Christ is God. That he *did not sin* is readily admitted even by skeptics and unbelievers. All, from the days of Christ down to the present time, who have desired to sustain any character worthy of respect, have willingly and gladly accepted the doctrine that Christ "knew no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth," that he was "pure and undefiled, and separate from [unlike] sinners"—unlike sinful men who are capable of and liable to sin. His moral character of spotless purity, was uncontaminated and unaffected by sin. Neither the progress of intellectual light, nor the developments of the principles of interpretation and the higher criticism, nor the efforts of the ungodly to disprove the truth of the scriptures and the virtue of Christ as the atoning sacrifice for sin, have made it necessary to discuss the question whether Christ did sin or not. The verdict of the intellectual thinking world is that Christ *did not sin*.

But the merit of his sacrifice, the intrinsic worth of the temptation to the Church, and the glory of Christ as the Redeemer, may depend on the nature of his person, or on his power to resist evil, and overcome what all must acknowledge to be a weakness in him, if indeed he could sin.

The question which we think affects the subject in all its bearings, and the character of Christ as our redeemer, is not whether he did sin, but whether he did not sin because he *would not*, or because he *could not*?

Which are we to believe the *non posse peccare*, or the *posse non peccare* doctrine? Which fits in best with the character of the being through whom we look for redemption? which gives him the highest character as a Saviour, and the greatest glory for our redemption?

We are aware that some great men have maintained that Christ could have sinned, that if the possibility of sinning had not been given to Christ, and the ability to yield to temptation, he could not have been a perfect man, and there could not have been any virtue in his resisting temptation: and that the whole transaction would have been a farce, and Christ would have been playing the role of a deceiver. From *Dons Scotus* and *Socinus* down to Drs. *Dorner*, *Schaff*, and *Hodge*, a few have held this doctrine. Even in our own Church we find such men as *Knapp* and others, arguing thus: "We are frequently exhorted to imitate the example of Jesus in his virtue, his conquest of sinful desires, etc. But could this be done if he had none of those inducements to sin which we have, and if it had been impossible for him to commit it."

But while a few have, because of a mistaken view of the person of Christ, fallen into this error, the great majority have held firmly to the doctrine that it was impossible for our Lord Jesus Christ to sin.

Scherzer, quoted approvingly by *Schmid*, page 323, has the following: "Christ never sinned, nor was he even able to sin. We prove the statement that he was not even able to sin, or that he was impeccable, as follows: He who is like men, sin only excepted, cannot be peccable, for since all men are peccable, Christ would be like them also with regard to sin and peccability, which contradicts the apostle, Heb. 7 : 26. He who is both holy by his origin, and is exempt from original sin, who can never have a depraved will, and constitutes one person with God himself, is clearly impeccable. He who is higher than the angels is altogether impeccable. He to whom the Holy Ghost is given with-

out measure is also holy and just without measure, and therefore cannot sin."

Hollazius adds: "Immortality belongs to him both because of the soundness of an impeccable nature, and the indissoluble bond of the personal union. Christ, therefore, is immortal by reason of intrinsic principle."

Capability to sin involves danger and uncertainty, liability to fail, and is in itself a source of temptation, all of which is incompatible with the character of the Redeemer. He never in all his life on earth, though the very strongest inducements were offered him, intimated the slightest wish or desire to disobey his Father's will. Indeed, he could not, for his will and his Father's will were one. He never expressed any sense of remorse for any act of his life, never repented of any deed, never expressed any fear of falling, or failing in his mission, never exhibited any sense of indwelling weakness or imperfection; but on the contrary, avowed on all occasions and in the most positive terms, his perfection of character, and his absolute independence of Satan's power. "The prince of this world cometh, and findeth nothing in me." He meant by this that there was in him absolutely nothing to which Satan could appeal. There was something in the angels while on probation, something in Adam while on probation, to which the tempter could appeal; but Christ while on earth, working out a redemption for man, was not in a state of trial or probation, but was his own master, lawgiver and judge. So that in him there was literally nothing to which Satan could make his final appeal. He had tried and utterly failed; and now when the dreadful scenes of Gethsemane and Calvary were to be enacted, and the Godhood of Christ should in a great measure be withdrawn, Satan would make his last effort to thwart the plan of divine mercy, but even then, in those dark hours of the Saviour's life, he would find absolutely nothing upon which to fix his attack. The perfection of his human nature was such, that even when his divinity was veiled and partially withdrawn, Satan could find nothing in him. Lange says: "No point of seizure." Alford says: "No point of appliance whereon to fix his attack."

It may be objected to this view that the possibility of sinning

is necessary to the entireness of human nature, and to make Christ truly a human being and the temptation real, we must of necessity admit the possibility of yielding and sinning. We can reply that the possibility of sinning may not be an essential of human nature, nor a condition of temptation. Enoch and Elijah are human beings to-day, complete in soul and body, and lacking nothing that is essential to complete human nature; and they are perfect and incapable of sinning. So shall all saints be after the resurrection, and yet they will be clothed with complete humanity. Capability of sinning is an accident of humanity in this world, and not an essential. It is an essential in a state of probation, but not otherwise, and humanity need not necessarily be in a state of trial to be perfect, but rather the contrary. Nor is the perfection of Enoch and Elijah owing to an opportunity to sin, or to an occasion for the tempter. The angels in heaven and Enoch and Elijah are forever established in holiness and are therefore forever incapable of sinning, so that if it were possible for the tempter to make an appeal to them, he would find, as in the case of Christ, nothing in them to appeal to. They have passed their day of trial, their probation is ended, and they are forever established in holiness. Christ's holiness was established in his perfect humanity from the beginning.

Nor is the possibility of sinning a condition of temptation. It may be of yielding, but not of temptation. Temptation is just as real when offered to the strong Christian, who instantly resists it, as to the weak brother who falls. Temptation to steal is as strong in its offer, in its opportunity, when offered to the honest man as when offered to the thief.

It is unwise and unphilosophic to say that temptation implies a possibility of sinning, and a liability to sin. It is as much as to say that there is more virtue in the wicked heart, that meditates murder, theft, or adultery, but for want of opportunity, or for prudential reasons, is kept from it, than in the good man who has never allowed such thoughts to suggest themselves, or who, when the opportunity did present itself, instantly turned from it. In the same degree with which we hate sin will we

love virtue and be virtuous, and to hate sin *absolutely* is to be perfect, and is to put the individual above the power of evil.

THE MORAL BEARINGS OF THE TEMPTATION.

How was it possible for Christ to be tempted unless he could sin? We have already said that peccability, is not necessary to temptation. The reality of a temptation does not at all depend on the peccability of the subject. Moral evil and the temptation to commit moral evil are not one and the same thing. Daniel was tempted when thrown into the lion's den, and Judas was tempted to betray Christ. In both instances the temptation was real, but the effects very different. If temptation can be offered when, because of the grace of God it is impossible for the subject to sin, or in other words, when there is in the soul of the good man nothing to appeal to, nothing to invite or seduce, cannot that same temptation be offered to one who is absolutely perfect? I have three neighbors whom I wish to inveigle into the commission of some crime. The conditions necessary to carry out my plans are that each pay me one thousand dollars. The first has the money, but is so established in the virtue of honesty that he instantly repudiates the offer; the second has the money and becomes party to the transaction; the third is very willing and anxious, but has no money and therefore cannot become a party to the crime. Is not the temptation as real, and was it not as really presented to the first and third, as to the second? In the first there is, in a good sense, impeccability, as far as that temptation is concerned; at least it amounts to impeccability. So that we may not say that there was nothing in the temptation of Christ, if he was not able to sin. Was there not more virtue in the first man, in the above illustration, than in the third? One did not yield, could not, because of his virtuous character, the other did not yield because of the lack of ability; but they were not alike impeccable, nor alike virtuous.

WHY THEN WAS CHRIST TEMPTED?

Certainly not to prove that he was capable of sinning; for it did not in the least prove this, for he did not sin. If it proved

anything in this regard it proved that he could not sin. The temptation was not for the purpose of establishing him in holiness, for he was from the first pure and undefiled. While it was not a test of his character, it was an illustration, a manifestation of that character. His work as redeemer depended, not on the temptation of the devil, but on his pure, perfect, spotless character. He must of necessity be a pure and spotless character, and he must illustrate and make known that character in order that men may believe on him. He is not to be regarded as a truth-seeker, a light-hunter, and as such found out things by testing matters, and made them known to man; but he was himself the way, the truth, and the life; and each event of his life was a revelation of his character and a new evidence of his perfection. He was a pattern for us in all things, and the pattern must be perfect and infallible. The temptation was necessary to make known *to us*, not to himself, that he was entirely above the reach of Satan's power.

The main reasons for the temptations are generally summed up under four heads. 1st. He must set us an *example in condescension and humiliation*. Of his own free will he *submitted to a great annoyance*, and thus left us a great example of patience and fortitude. The glorious and all-perfect Lord of heaven submits to the annoyances of the evil one whose power he came to destroy. Surely such an example of condescension and humiliation is encouraging to us who are trying to imitate his pure example. And surely his example is as worthy of imitation as it would have been had he been frail and weak, and liable to fall. Can we think less of him and his example because he was fortified against the attacks of Satan by the perfection of his character? 2d. He set an example of *firmness and constancy* under the pressure of adverse circumstances, which is worthy of all praise. The value to us of this example is illustrated by the influence such an example given by a fellow-man is likely to have on us. The firmer any such man is under temptation and annoyances the more worthy we take the example to be. We take a very high example to be indicative of a very great degree of moral worth. Now let us know that the example comes from a perfect model, and how precious the example itself be-

comes, and how worthy of our imitation. Surely the idea of weakness and liability to failure could not in the least heighten our admiration for the Saviour's firmness and constancy. 3rd. He proved himself to be *greater and stronger than all the powers of darkness*. And who will say that virtue absolutely impregnable is not as valuable as virtue purified by contact with evil? Who will claim that gold without alloy is purer than that which has passed through the hands of the assayer? Christ claimed to be greater than all the armed forces of earth and hell, and in his encounter with the devil he proved it; and now we know that he did not claim more than belonged to Him. 4th. He became *familiar with the trials and annoyances to which his dear children are necessarily subjected, and in which they need his help*, and thus we are certified of his *sympathy*. "He was in all points tempted like as we are." He was made perfect, not in his person, but in his office, by suffering.

The great trouble with some has been to understand how Christ could set an example for us and sympathize with us unless he was liable to sin. Hence Knapp says: "If it should be *impossible* for a man to live otherwise than virtuously, or if his virtue should be necessary, it would have no value and no merit. All freedom in that case would vanish and man would become a mere machine." However much these remarks may apply to man, they do not, as Knapp intended, apply to our Lord Jesus Christ, the God-man. God certainly is free, and yet it is impossible for him to lie, to sin, to be unholy. Angels in heaven are not mere machines. The obedience of angels and saints in heaven is just as pleasing to God as that of men on earth. The Saviour certainly was free in the voluntary obedience which he rendered to his Father while on earth, and in the exercise of that freedom it was not at all necessary that he should be free to sin. Christians are free to do right, but not free to sin; for if they sin wilfully and persistently they cease to be Christians. Free moral agency necessarily belongs to beings in probation, not necessarily to volunteer agency. Christ volunteered to redeem man, and he volunteered to endure the annoyance of the temptation. Those who run a parallel between the first and second Adam, and thus furnish an argument in favor of Christ's

peccability, forget St. Paul's parallel: "The first Adam was made a living soul [liable to fall], the last Adam was made a quickening spirit"—giving out life, and bringing life and immortality to light. "The first man is of the earth, earthy [and hence liable to sin] the second man is the Lord from heaven," and being the Lord, he was impeccable.

Nor can the probable peccability of Christ be argued from the ground that uncertainty of action is necessary to free agency. Free agency does not consist in indifference, nor in an equal bias towards good and bad; right and wrong contingency does not belong to perfection, and hence does not belong to God, did not belong to Christ the God-man. Contingency does not belong to free agency, for God is a free agent, and to him nothing is contingent.

Nor need we believe Christ to have been peccable in order that he may sympathize with those who are peccable. We sympathize with our fellow-men in their troubles, when we ourselves are raised, by circumstances, above their troubles. We may know how to deliver them, though we may never have had the inward experiences which they endure. Christ felt all the humiliation and annoyance which the temptation brought with it. The whole transaction was as unpleasant to him as a temptation can be to us. And it is only unpleasantness and annoyance that temptation can bring; it is the yielding to it that brings regret, remorse, and a sense of degradation and of guilt.

And surely there is as much to give me courage and encouragement and strength in the reflection that the Being upon whom I can rely in my hours of trial, is now, and always was, above the power that threatens me, as to think of him as weak as I am yet more virtuous than I, and therefore able to help me. Indeed, we cannot imagine how the idea of the peccability of Christ could in any way heighten our sense of his power, grace, love, sympathy or compassion, or make him in any sense a more powerful or dear Saviour than the view we take.

The Lutheran view of the Person of Christ necessitates the doctrine of his impeccability; and the proper understanding of his impeccability gives to the temptation a sublimer meaning and a deeper significance, and to Christ a greater glory and more vir-

tuous merit, and to the trusting Christian a better and firmer ground for sympathy and help in times of temptation, than the doctrine of Christ's liability to sin, and therefore of an imperfect Christ.

ARTICLE III.

THE RELATION OF BAPTIZED CHILDREN TO THE CHURCH.

By REV. MARK S. CRESSMAN, A. M., Lionville, Pa.

It has been estimated that fully one-sixth of the human race is under fourteen years of age. Strange as it may seem, yet there are those who, by theory and practice, regard this portion of humanity as "out of the category of grace." Children are not, it is asserted by such, proper subjects for Christian baptism, and consequently there is no place for them in the Church. They are treated as "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope and without God in the world." According to this view, the Church exists only for adults. Into this Church the vilest of the vile may come, but not our innocent babes and children. Christ cannot be their Saviour, for according to this view, he sustains "no official relationship" to them. "They are," says Bushnell in characterizing this scheme, "all outside the salvation fold, hardening there in the storm, till their choosing, refusing, desiring, sinning power is sufficiently unfolded to have a place assigned them within." Well does this writer raise the question, "Is this Christianity?" The great body of the Church Catholic says, no!

All that has been done is, to strip a well known theory of its dress, and present it in its naked form. If the picture is not a pleasant one to look upon, the fault is not the writer's. Attention is called to it, to be the better able to set forth an opposite view, with which it stands in striking contrast.

With but few exceptions, the great body of the Christian Church, since its establishment, has admitted the validity of infant baptism, with all it involves. It has been urged upon parents, both as a duty and privilege to place their offspring into

covenant relation with the Saviour of mankind in the divinely appointed way. The purpose of this paper is not to defend this ancient practice of the Church, nor to establish what Origen has called, "an apostolic tradition or bequeathment"—*παραδόσις αποστολική*—for to do this, would be a work of supererogation in a Lutheran periodical. The present inquiry is concerning the relation of baptized children to the Church: not that there is any difference of opinion in the Church on this subject, but for the purpose of emphasizing this relationship, and awakening to a sense of the obligations thereby imposed.

In order to correctly understand and define this relationship, it is necessary to consider, briefly, the doctrine and significance of baptism. This ordinance was instituted by Christ, and was designed as a means of grace. Its observance was not left to the choice of the individual, but has been made obligatory upon all. Christ had said, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Baptism was not designed as an empty form, for this would not have elevated it above the Jewish rite of circumcision, which it was intended to displace. Paul calls it "the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost;" and again, "the washing of water by the word." With this well accords Luther's definition—"It is the water comprehended in God's command, and connected with God's word." The Lutheran Church has very properly placed much stress upon this sacrament. The doctrine of baptism is one of the distinctive features of Lutheranism. Her theologians have treated this subject in the fullest and most satisfactory manner possible. Yet here, as elsewhere, they have been greatly misunderstood, and reputed to believe and teach views our Church has ever repudiated. Space will not permit a refutation of errors charged. The briefest possible statement of what we do hold and teach concerning this great subject must suffice our present purpose.

The Lutheran Church teaches that baptism is "a *necessary* and *saving* ordinance." So Paul declares in Titus 3 : 5. Luther in his Larger Catechism says: "Baptism is no mere plaything of human invention, but has been instituted by God himself, who has earnestly and strictly commanded that we should cause our-

selves to be baptized, or we cannot be saved. No man is to think of it as a trifling matter—the mere putting on of a new coat." In Art. ix, of the Augsburg Confession, we have this language: "Respecting baptism it is taught that it is necessary, that grace is offered through it; and that children ought to be baptized, who through such baptism are presented to God, and become acceptable to him." God works through appointed means, and as Martensen puts it, "The Church is bound by the appointment of her Lord." This necessity is further defined as not *absolute*, but *ordinate*, that is, for the sake of good order. The late Dr. J. A. Brown has summed up the teaching of our Church concerning baptism as follows: "When rightly used, it is one of the means whereby the Holy Ghost is given, and regeneration is effected. It ascribes efficacy to it, not as an *opus operatum*, but as a sacrament, having in it the word of God. The whole efficacy is ascribed to the word, and faith in that word, accompanied by the Holy Ghost, working when and where he will." When the Lutheran Church teaches that regeneration is effected through baptism, she is not to be understood as looking upon this Sacrament as possessing a magical power to wash away sin. Baptismal regeneration, in the vulgar sense, has never been held by the Lutheran Church. Her theologians were men of too acute minds to so misinterpret Scripture. She maintains, however, that in baptism, grace is both offered and sealed, and a new covenant established, to which covenant God ever remains faithful.

The object of baptism has been stated with much force and beauty by Bishop Martensen, as "to spread the spirit of hope in God's election of grace throughout life, to be a sign from heaven upon which believers may base the certainty of their election; a certainty which cannot be retained by merely inward convictions in the midst of life's changes, but which must be associated with a visible *sign*, like the rainbow, to which they can look back in the midst of the storms of life in time of external and inward need; a bow of hope in the clouds appearing as the rainbow did in the days of Noah."

Sight is not to be lost of the fact that baptism is an ordinance committed to the Church. Its true import only appears in this

connection. As a churchly rite it is a badge of distinction, by which the children of God may be known from the children of this world, and marks the entrance of the former into the visible Church. Gerhard accordingly speaks of it as "the sacrament of initiation." It is the means appointed by Christ for induction into his Church. The apostles were bidden to disciple all nations by baptizing them in the name of the Holy Trinity. The significant fact is ever to be borne in mind, that baptism is the only gateway into the Church, and alone has the sanction of the Master. Confirmation is not an ordinance of the Lord's, but a human institution, and as such is intended simply as a public ratification of the baptismal vows. Hence we conclude, that a person once having the sacrament of baptism properly administered, by that act is placed, once for all, into connection with the Church. Confirmation is not to be regarded as completing the baptismal act. To do so would be a reflection upon the wisdom of the Great Head of the Church. Man cannot add to his work. The writer is not to be understood as casting any reflections on the rite of Confirmation, in the propriety of which he is a firm believer. Emphasis is simply given to the fact, that it is not *Confirmation*, but *Baptism*, which gives the individual a place in the Christian Church. The time of baptism marks the period when membership begins. It is Christ's ordinance, and not man's, which makes us members of his body. Martensen, in speaking of the two-fold significance of this initiatory rite, has correctly said: "Baptism, as a *human* ceremony, is an act of confession, by which a person is admitted into Christ's Church, but as a *divine* ceremony, it is the act by which Christ, our invisible High Priest and King, establishes his Church within the individual, and consecrates him in a true relation to God."

We are now prepared to give an unequivocal and intelligent answer to the question concerning the relation of baptized children to the Church, viz., that they are members of Christ's Church, and are so regarded by him. A new-born babe, to whom the sacrament of baptism has been administered, is as fully a member of the Church, in view of that act, as the gray-haired sire, who, perchance, for well nigh three-fourths of a century, has been a pillar in Zion. Practically, too little has been

made of this fact, yea, at times it seems almost lost sight of, yet the fact itself is not thereby invalidated.

If the writer has succeeded in making himself understood, his task is almost completed. He has sought to let stand out in its true light the fact of infant church-membership, and the rational and scriptural grounds upon which it rests. Efforts have been made to make this relationship appear absurd, but, as has been shown, the absurdity is with those who deny it. This relationship is not a *modern* dogma, nor a peculiarity of Christianity, for it had its origin in the Jewish Church. When God established his covenant with Abraham, children (babes) were expressly included. To forbid, under the Gospel, what was permitted, yea, ordained under the Law,—to withhold the privileges of the Church from all but those who are able to appreciate them,—is to make Christianity narrower than Judaism. Christ said: "Suffer the little children, and forbid them not to come unto me; for of such is the kingdom of heaven." What more could the blessed Master have said? To no adult was never spoken a freer invitation. Since Christ has opened the doors of his Church to my child, I regard it an act of sacrilegious presumption for any one to attempt to close it. God's covenant with Abraham was not to end with the Jewish Church, but was to be perpetually binding. Once included in the Church, infants cannot be deprived of their rights without special divine command. It would certainly be strange if human opinions could annul a divine decree. To continue under the new, what was granted under the old dispensation, a new command was not necessary.

By some it is assumed, that because infant membership has not been formally asserted in the New Testament, therefore, it does not exist. Did it ever occur to such objectors, that if valid, this objection shuts out woman from the Lord's table? We have no *record* of women ever communing in apostolic times. The existence of God would have to be denied on the same ground, for the Bible nowhere attempts to prove it. What is not denied, or is undeniable, needs no proof. In the early Church, the question was never so much as raised, as to the

propriety of infant membership. Those who composed it never knew anything else. The writers of the New Testament had too much else to communicate, to answer questions which were never raised, to meet supposed difficulties: they left such things to medieval theology. To have done this would have required many volumes instead of one. As St. John says in closing his Gospel: "The world itself could not contain the books that should be written." Bushnell has well said concerning the Scriptural statements on this subject: "According to a coarse way of judging, * * they are not as strong as they might be. And yet, in a more perceptive and really truer mode of judgment, they lack that kind of strength just because they have too much of another, which is deeper and more satisfying to suffer it. So familiar is the idea to all Jewish minds, of a religious oneness in parents and their offsprings, that a church institution of any kind, arranged to include parents and not their offspring, would have been a shocking offense to the Jewish nation." We do know that among the many objections raised by the Jews against Christianity, the charge that children were excluded from the Church, does not appear. Had such a state existed, it would have been objected to with all the force crafty minds could have commanded, and would have proved fatal to the influence of Christianity among them. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews would not have been able so successfully to have convinced his readers of the superiority of Christianity over Judaism, had the rights of children been denied or ignored.

The Scriptures, however, are not absolutely silent upon this subject. They do bear a testimony, which, as Bushnell has well remarked, is but the stronger because indirect and incidental. Paul addresses his Epistle to the Colossians: "To the saints and faithful brethren in Christ which are at Colosse." If this letter be carefully read, it will be found to contain admonitions to the different classes which composed that church—masters, servants, parents and *children*. To the latter he says: "Children obey your parents in all things; for this is well pleasing unto the Lord." The Epistle to the Ephesians is inscribed in the same way: "To the saints which are at Ephesus, and to the faithful

in Christ." In addressing this church, Paul speaks of husbands, wives, fathers, mothers, masters, servants and *children*. Of each of these classes he makes special mention, and recognizes their right to a place in the Church. To the lambs of the flock he gives this loving admonition: "Children, obey your parents in the Lord; for this is right." We thus see that the great apostle, by implication, regards *children* as members of the Church. He addresses them, not as aliens, but as citizens of the kingdom. Peter, in his sermon on the day of Pentecost, did not lose sight of "the organic unity of the family." He calls to Christ, not adults and heads of families only, but whole households. He says: "The promise is to you, and your *children*." Peter evidently knew nothing of the modern gospel which calls parents *away* from their children. With that pernicious individualism, which would rob our offspring of their birthright, he had no sympathy.

It militates nothing against the reality or genuineness of this membership, that the subjects of it, for years, are not aware that it exists. Neither is it invalidated because children are not subjects of church discipline, and are not qualified for an active discharge of church duties. Does any one pretend that a child cannot be an heir because it is too young to be cognizant of the fact that a large sum has been bequeathed to it? Does the law regard our children any the less citizens because they cannot bear arms, or do not pay taxes? Is not the new born babe as much a citizen as the aged sire who bears the scars of many battles on his person, received in the defense of his country? Are not the rights of the former as fully protected as those of the latter? A few years ago, when little Charlie Ross was abducted, the detective force of the civilized world was on the alert to apprehend the criminals. More could not have been done to deliver this child from his captors, had it been the President of the U. S., who had been abducted. Child-citizenship is indisputed. It would be strange, indeed, if human law were more loving and thoughtful in its provisions than that divine institution, the Christian Church. Child-membership is therefore, not a figure of speech, and existing only in the language of theology, but is as one puts it, "*potentially real*." Our children are

the lambs of Christ's flock, and as such, doubtless receive the especial care of the Great Shepherd. More than seven-hundred years before his advent, Isaiah prophesied of Christ: "He shall gather the lambs with his arm, and carry them in his bosom." How is this being fulfilled, but in the manner indicated? By baptism the little ones are folded into Christ's flock, and become part of the same.

In view of this relationship, the Church has well defined obligations imposed upon it. To care for the young is no small part of the Church's work. To Peter, the Master said: "Feed my lambs." It becomes therefore the bounden duty of the Church to make provision for the religious education of her infant members. Cotton Mather has quaintly said: "The Lord hath not set up churches only that a few old Christians may keep one another warm while they live, and then carry the church with them when they die; no, but that they might with all care, and with all obligations and advantages to that care that may be, nurse still successively another generation of subjects to our Lord, that they may stand up in his kingdom when they are gone." It will thus be seen, that catechisation has its appointed place in the Church, and can be neglected only at the peril of precious souls. No *modern* theories of church-work can do away with the catechetical class. After the translation of the Bible, Luther did no better work than preparing his little manual of religious instruction, which stands to-day without a rival.

This training of the young is to be *in* the Church, not *out* of it. Let it ever be borne in mind, that baptized children are already members of the Church, and are to be instructed accordingly. They are to be addressed, not as heathens, but as young Christians. It is a great wrong to the children to ignore their baptism, and regard them as in an unregenerate state. A false "scheme of personal experience" is too often held up before them. Their conversion is the point aimed at. They are taught to believe they "must be born again." What significance can baptism have to a child thus taught? Is it any wonder that in mature years such an one regards the ordinance with indifference? Far better is it to build upon his baptism as a

foundation, and to stir up the gift that is within him. It is too common an error that little or nothing is made of the baptism of children. Need we wonder, that in some places, the sacred rite is almost obsolete? Children are too often taught "a religion that begins explosively, raises high frames, carries little or no expansion, and after the campaign is over, subsides into a torpor." The aim of the religious instruction of the young should be, to train them up for an intelligent discharge of their duties as members of Christ's Church. Confirmation will then be, not a mere ceremony, but the personal assumption of Christian obligations.

How often are persons admitted to the Holy Communion by a confession which makes nothing of their previous membership. By this so called confession, they are led to believe they become members of the Church. Is it any wonder that such under-rate and neglect infant baptism? The Church, too often in *practice*, denies what she maintains in *theory*. It is because of this, Bushnell pleaded for a "form of assumption tendered in the place of a confession—something answering to the Lutheran Confirmation." Our fathers builded wisely when they retained this rite in the Church. Those churches that have discarded Confirmation, as a relic of popery, have not succeeded in finding a suitable substitute. Though but a human ordinance, yet as Martensen says, "Confirmation must be regarded as a work of the Spirit in the Church." It is the direct outgrowth of baptism and infant membership. The Lutheran Church demands no new confession from those she confirms. The confession was made, once for all, in baptism. Confirmation, is therefore a reminder of baptism, and as such has great value.

In view of all that has been written, how great must be the duty and responsibility of parents who have placed their children in the Christian Church. Their obligations cannot be passed over to the Church. They must be met and fulfilled. Children are to be brought "up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." All that has been said concerning religious instruction at the hands of the Church, might with propriety, be repeated in this connection. Parents are divinely appointed

guardians. They should train up their offspring for Christ, as they are his, in virtue of their baptism.

To deny children the Sacrament does not lessen parental responsibility, as some have vainly supposed, but rather increases it. Parents who fail to bring their children to Christ, in his own appointed way, are robbing them of their birthright, and consequently do them great harm. Christian nature *begins* with baptism, and when properly followed up, cannot fail of its purpose. Let Christian parents recognize their baptized children as members of the Church, rejoicing that they may be one with them in the Lord, even as they are in the flesh. In the home, the seeds of piety should be sown, and the first fruits displayed. In this sense there should be a church in every house. All the inmates thereof should be in constant training for active church-fellowship. The fact should never be lost sight of, that the seal of faith is upon our children, and that they are heirs with us of the same precious promises. Says one, whose age and experience gave him a right to speak on the subject: "One great reason why the children of Christian parents turn out so badly is, that they are taken to be of the world, and the manner and spirit of the house are brought down to be of the world too, and partly for their sake. Take them as the disciples of Jesus, to be carefully trained for him; prepared to no mere worldly tastes, and fashions, and pleasures, but kept in purity, saved from the world, and led forth under all tender examples of obedience and godly living; and it will be strange if that nature of the Lord does not show them growing up in the faith, to be sons and daughters, indeed, of the Lord Almighty."

ARTICLE IV.

LE CONTE'S BOOK ON EVOLUTION AS RELATED TO RELIGIOUS THOUGHT.*

By REV. E. H. DELK, Jr., Hagerstown, Md.

A splendid book in typography, material, style, purpose and spirit! The work is divided into three parts:

I. *What Is Evolution?* Under this division is given a concise account of what is meant by Evolution in the broadest sense, as well as defining the modern dogma of organic derivation.

II. *Evidences of the Truth of Evolution.* This part outlines the evidences gathered from the general laws of animal structure, *i. e.* homologies of vertebrate skeletons; homologies of articulate skeletons; proofs from embryology; proofs from geographical distribution of organisms; proofs from artificial production of varieties, races, species, etc.

III. *The Relation of Evolution to Religious Thought.* This treats of Evolution as related to our fundamental religious beliefs. In this section Evolution is presented in its relation to materialism; the relation of God to nature; the relation of man to nature; the relation of God to man. The two final chapters meet the charge of pantheism as applied to the writer's conception of God's immanence in the world's development and the significance of evil, both in the physical and moral realm.

The first and second parts are intended simply as brief summaries of the voluminous literature upon the doctrine of Evolution. The thought of the third part of the work is what really provoked the publication of the book and makes it worthy the attention of every Christian scholar.

Evolution is defined as (1) continuous *progressive change*, (2) *according to certain laws*, (3) and by means of *resident forces*.

**Evolution and Its Relation to Religious Thought*, by Joseph Le Conte, author of "Religion and Science," etc., and Professor of Geology and Natural History in the University of California. pp. iv., 338. 1889. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

Upon the general fact of creation by derivation, *i. e.* Evolution, we believe the great body of modern biologists agree. Prof. Le Conte says of it: "In its most general sense, *i. e.* as the law of continuity, it is a necessary condition of rational thought. * * It is not only as certain as—it is far more certain than—the law of gravitation, for it is not a contingent but a necessary truth like the axioms of geometry. It is only necessary to conceive it clearly, to accept it unhesitatingly. The consensus of scientific and philosophical opinion is already well-nigh, if not wholly complete. If there are still lingering cases of dissent among thinking men, it is only because such do not yet conceive it clearly—they *confound it with some special form of explanation of evolution* [the italics are our own] which they, perhaps justly, think not yet fully established." This we think is frankly and truthfully put. There are still some great names left upon the side of anti-evolution—Dawson, Mivart and Virchow. The latter said respecting Darwinism at the recent Anthropological Congress in Vienna:

"Twenty years ago when we met at Innsbruck, Darwinism made its first triumphant march through the world, and my friend Vogt at once vigorously espoused the cause of this doctrine. In vain have we sought for connecting links between man and the apes; the ancestors of man, the real *Proanthropos*, has not yet been found. At that time, in Innsbruck, it seemed as if the process of descent from the ape to man could be constructed by storm. Now, however, we cannot even trace the descent of the different races from one another. At this moment we can say that among people of ancient times none have been found who were nearer the apes than we are. I can affirm at present that there is no absolutely unknown race of men on earth. Every living race is human; none has been found which we could either call Simian or between the ape and man. So far as the pile-structures are concerned, I have been able to examine nearly all the skulls found, and the result is that we find differences between the various tribes, but that not one of these tribes lies outside of the range of still existing people. It can be definitely proven that in the course of five thousand years no change of types worthy of mention has occurred. If to-day you ask me

whether the first human beings were white or black, I shall have to answer: I do not know."

So then it is possible to reject the dogma of evolution without being a fool. But we repeat our conviction that the great body of modern biologists and philosophers have accepted the doctrine of creation by derivation rather than spasmodic manufacture. The complaint of the theist is, that a materialistic interpretation has been forced upon it by Darwin and Hæckle. Prof. Le Conte seeks to redeem the theory from such a charge. Although in his first and second parts he offers in explanation of the theory four purely natural factors, in the third part he gives a much broader and more subtle meaning to natural forces than the ordinary scientific student and theologian attributes to them. It would perhaps be more exact to say, that, in his last part, he furnishes the vital, guiding principle which during the period of world-gestation finally appears in man.

He finds no difficulty in believing that at some period in time, spontaneous generation was possible, although the conditions favorable to such an event can not *now* be reproduced, and this he considers perfectly in harmony with theistic thought. In the development of the inorganic kingdom, all are agreed, that the time factor is immeasurable and permitting the time factor for variations under the four great factors of Evolution, then *species*, as well as firmament, continents, kingdoms, classes, orders, families and varieties can be accounted for by the operation of natural law. Species is the last rampart to be taken. When this last step is taken, the victory for the reign of law will be complete. The taxonomic series and ontogenic series are the allies and furnish strong evidence for the truth of the phylogenic series. Prof. Le Conte, in the first two parts of his work, has adopted four main factors in producing this progressive change according to certain laws and by means of resident forces.

First, he adopts Lamarck's two factors—"physical environment" and "the use and disuse of certain organs." Next, he uses Darwin's two factors of "natural selection" and "sexual selection." Then he adds a fifth, as filling up the deficiency,

"physiological selection," which was suggested by Romanes. If we were to stop with the second part of his book and fail to read his doctrine of divine *immanence*, we must admit that Le Conte lays himself open to as bald a materialism as Darwin.

Just here, however, there are two things we are to remember: First, his own admission that "there are doubtless other factors, not dreamed of in our philosophy, yet to be discovered." He does not, it is true, admit the "internal formative principle" of Lamarck and our own great Cope, but he does not, on the other hand, combat the idea of other determining qualities. The other truth we must bear in mind, in reading the works of the scientific naturalist, is well put by John Fiske in his *Idea of God*: "The business of science is simply to ascertain in what manner phenomena coëxist with each other or follow each other, and the only kind of explanation with which it can properly deal is that which refers one set of phenomena to another set. In pursuing this, its legitimate business, science does not touch on the province of theology in any way, and there is no conceivable occasion for any conflict between the two." Philosophical theism presupposes the action of Deity, but such a reference is not an explanation of a given set of phenomena, since it adds nothing to our previous knowledge either of the phenomena or of the manner of divine action.

Prof. Le Conte is a firm believer in the transmutation of species and adroitly fortifies the weak points of the proof by several candid admissions. He says: "The *cause* of variation is unknown." Again: "It is freely admitted by the Evolutionist that species are *now* usually distinct and without intermediate links, these having been destroyed in the struggle for life." And again: "It is also freely admitted that although intermediate links must have existed at one time, their remains are rarely found." But he is quick to furnish both reason and proof (p. 230) why these breaks in the evolutionary records occur.

The argument is stiffened by examples contained in part second. Into the varied proofs contained in part second we hardly dare to venture, but there are a few points which, to our mind, are not convincing. The proofs drawn from homologies among

the vertebrata and articulata are impressive and clearly illustrated in excellent drawings.

The force of these facts we have always felt to be one of the strongest claims made by the derivationists and certainly marks a similarity of ground plan for the working out of all forms of skeletons within these special classes. It is when we reach the proof from embryonic morphology that we feel the weakness of evolutionary logic. Because the human embryo passes through the semblance of all the lower animals—"a sort of sketch of the past history of the race"—we do not think it offers any proof of the necessary order or manner of phylogeny. It is reasoning from appearances of sameness which the facts show to be deceptive and false. St. George Mivart, in the *Forum* of March 1889, has certainly weakened the force of the proof from this argument.

There is another weak point, in the proof offered in the chapter on geographical distribution, *i. e.* the admitted fact that species, when they appear, present themselves with all their specific characteristics fully developed. They may as individuals increase in size and number, but at their first appearance they possess all the characteristics of developed species. Prof. Le Conte points out this fact in his own geology and makes the admission in this volume. True, he seeks to lessen the force of its influence against transmutation, but he finds it "a hard fence to take." See pp. 201 and 234.

But the most unsatisfactory argument, because it is the very storm centre of proof, is that drawn from artificial production of varieties, races, species, etc. No one can fail to admit the extraordinary modifications undergone by species in a wild state and under artificial selection. But these varieties naturally or artificially produced soon revert to the original type. Reversion, the absence of intermediate forms, and cross fertility are huge barriers in the way of any conclusive proof from artificial selection.

The theory of Dr. Romanes is made to do valiant service in this trying hour. The sexual isolation from the parent stock by *cross sterility* due to the *caprices of sexual relation*, is the last great gun to be fired at the miserable hybrids that like so many

stone walls balk the sure and gradual advancement of protoplasm to the presidency of Oxford or Cambridge.

We do heartily enjoy, however, the aptness of the writer's charge against the anti-evolutionist. "They define species as ultimate elements of taxonomy, as distinct and without intermediate links, and then require us to find such intermediate links; and finally, when with infinite pains some such links are found, they say: 'Oh! I see: we were mistaken; they are only varieties!'"

The writer seeks to check such evasion by a strong example of extraordinary modification, *i. e.* fossil forms of the Tertiary fresh-water deposits of Steinheim. Prof. Cope adds his conservative testimony drawn from the extinct mammalian period thus: "Such transitions of species are clearly indicated in the *oreodontidæ*, where such different forms as *O. gracilis* and *O. Culbertsoni* are connected by intergradations." Causes or forces are constant, but phenomena everywhere and in every department of nature are *paroxysmal*. We dare not then expect to find a completely graded series either in the geographical or geological scale.

Here we must stop, for our limited space warns us that if we are to treat the distinctive feature of this excellent work—the relation of Religious Thought to Evolution, no more time can be given to the proofs of evolution. Upon the general truth of evolution we are free to pronounce the Scotch verdict—"guilty but not proven."

Upon the last and most important part of this work we hesitate to enter, fearing we may mar the author's noble attempt at reconciling what to many seem eternal foes—evolution and Christian theism. "You have banished God from nature" is the cry of the average religionist to the derivationist. This cry was made against gravitation, against geologic aeons, and a host of other scientific innovations into the realm of petrified theology. Is the cry just? What has the theistic evolutionist to say for himself! The first chapter in part third treats of "the relation of evolution to materialism." There is no more necessary connection of the modern doctrine of natural derivation and materialism than between gravitation and materialism—both are

established laws of nature and materialism an unwarranted and hasty inference from the laws. Because the gaping crowd has discovered how the statue was made shall it turn in disgust from the sculptor's studio and pronounce the grand product shorn of all interest? "God is an honest worker, according to reason—*i. e.*, according to law—ought not science rather to change gaping wonder into intelligent delight—superstition into rational worship. * * * There are three possible views concerning the origin of the individual. The first is that of the pious child who thinks that he was made very much as he himself makes dirt-pies; the second is that of the street gamin, or Topsy, who says: "I was not made at all, I grewed;" the third is that of most intelligent Christians—*i. e.*, that we were made by a process of evolution. Now, there are also three exactly corresponding theories concerning the origin of species. The first is that of many pious persons and many intelligent clergymen, who say species were made at once by the divine hand *without natural process*. The second is that of the materialists, who say that species were not made at all, they were derived, "they grewed." The third is that of the theistic evolutionists, who think they were *created* by a process of evolution—who believe making is not inconsistent with growing." Theism still holds the fort..

The acceptance of this theory undoubtedly demands change and reconstruction in some of the fundamental dogmas of Christian theology. Prof. Le Conte does not pretend to say what that reconstructed theology will be, but recognizes that we are in a creed-forming epoch.

It is in the third chapter that the real kernel of his work is found. This he says is the real issue. "Either God is far more closely related with nature, and operates it in a more direct way than we have recently been accustomed to think, or else (mark the alternative) nature operates itself and needs no God at all. There is no middle ground tenable." Our Latin theologians have banished God from his universe. Augustine, tinctured with manichæism, thought matter too low a substance in which God would delight. The Greek theologians, Clement and Origen, and the German Lessing and Schleiermacher had the true idea of God's

immanence. The master mechanic idea must be substituted by the indwelling sustaining power that moves for order and righteousness. According to this true view the phenomena of nature are naught else than objectified modes of divine thought, the forces of nature naught else than different forms of one omnipresent divine energy or will, the laws of nature naught else than the regular modes of operation of the divine will, invariable because he is unchangeable." This is defended from the charge of Idealism, because it is the objectified thought of God, not man's thought. It is also defended from the charge of Pantheism because it does not sublimate the personality of the Deity into all pervading unconscious force, and thereby dissipates all our hopes of personal relation with him.

In the chapter, "The Relation of Man to Nature," he develops this thought of God's gradual envolving of his life through the varied operations of nature. "Now this upward movement has been wholly by *increasing individuation*, not only of matter, but also of *force*. This universal divine energy, in a generalized condition, *unindividuated*, diffused, pervading all nature, is what we call physical and chemical force. The same energy in higher form, individuating matter, and itself individuated, but only yet imperfectly, is what we call the life of plants. The same energy, more fully individuating matter and itself more fully individuated, but not completely, we call the *anima* of animals. This *anima*, or animal soul, as time went on, has individuated more and more until it resembled and foreshadowed the spirit of man. Finally, still the same energy, completely individuated as a separate entity, and therefore self-conscious, capable of separate existence, and therefore immortal, we call the spirit of man." * * * "As the *organic embryo* at birth reaches independent *material* or temporal *life*, even so *spirit embryo* by birth attains independent *spiritual* or *eternal* life." This as we have said is the gist of the philosophic exposition of theistic evolution.

The remaining chapters on "The Relation of God to Man" and "The Relation of Evolution to the Problem of Evil" are just and highly interesting developments of the foregoing thought. The argument from design is strengthened, and moral evil, al-

though rooted in animalism, is distinguished from mere physical non-conformity to environment. Virtue, not innocence, is the test of fitness. If I have aroused any curiosity, by this mutilated outline of the original work of Prof. Le Conte, my task has been performed. We can but urge all Christian and non-Christian thinkers to read this able attempt to spiritualize, what has long been looked upon as the foe of Christian thought. We close as we started—a splendid book in typography, material, style, purpose, and spirit.

ARTICLE V.

WITHOUT TEMPTATION.

By PROF. M. H. RICHARDS, D. D., Allentown, Pa.

This is a very unsatisfactory sort of world! Whatever we may profess to know about it, or however we may confess our ignorance of the divine idea in it, one and another of us is tempted, time and again, to join in saying: "Man delights not me; no, nor woman neither." The times are out of joint! We turn, fully persuaded from the abstract study of causes and effects, to find that the rule does not work in some especial concrete case. What ought to be, is not; and much that is, is wrong. Nor does it improve our temper to suspect that somewhat of the wrong is in us; we are much more disposed to have the betterment begin with other persons and other things.

Hence there is no end of theories and propositions showing how the world might, could, would, or should be made better, so as to become satisfactory. It is an old trade, and many a man has got his living by it; while not a few have caught their death from it. Quacks thrive best in this trade, since their medicines are palatable and easy to take, whatever the after-effect. At times whole nations have taken up the cry, insisting upon the nostrum of the day; often great parties parade some such dictum as the most significant word upon their ensign; seldom indeed that no one is posing as leader of a sect, whose following assure you that, if men would but adopt their principles, the

world would move on merrily, sin be abolished, poverty unknown, sickness unfelt, and death become again, as in pristine times, a far-off necessity. Meanwhile the unsatisfactory state of affairs simply continues.

It is interesting to note that almost all these theories deal with the environment. They seldom touch man himself; they are, as a rule, aimed at his external conditions. It may be that this is reached by imitation and analogy. If the world does not suit us physically, we alter its temperature, its moistness, its degree of light; why should we not alter the conditions of society just as well? Why should it be more difficult to abolish poverty by a law than to heat or light a town by a central plant of steam or electricity? Why not invent a legislative umbrella for keeping a whole community out of the showering drops of debauching appetite, just as we employ that useful rain-shield for protecting our body from a drenching? Evidently it is the environment that is wrong; give us a perfect environment and we will be "all right." Contagion is the cause of disease; bad company is the cause of ruin! To be clothed in our right mind, we need only better tailoring; and a more fitting garment!

At first sight, this prescription has something as reasonable about it, as fascinating. The analogy does seem to hold. Experience has shown that the bettering of the environment is possible, and that with it there is a corresponding improvement in man, a more satisfactory state of society. Cleanliness externally promotes decency internally; a better house and a pleasanter neighborhood make men better citizens; some people who would be intolerable if in extreme want, are fairly tolerable when supplied with a plenty of means; a bright sunshine makes us good-natured and generous; while a three days drizzle sours all our wine of gladness into biting acidity; some men are not in condition to confront the requirements of society, even domestic, until they have broken their fast of a morning. How much might therefore be done by feeding, clothing, housing the world aright by law; by putting some money in his pocket, making the sun shine for him; and regulating the temperature to suit him all the year around. Why not? Science knows everything, and can do everything! Why not? Is not money al-

mighty? Are there not enough almighty dollars in the world to do all these things? Pass a law, and have it done!

Somewhere about this point in the line of our felicitous reasoning we begin to feel a very unpleasant streak of chilling suspicion blow over us. We can lead ourselves up, by such promises, to a conclusion that seems irrefragable, but which a something higher than the syllogism tells us is unsound, impracticable, false, gushing nonsense. True, there are some men, impervious to any such suspicion, who go on in the full persuasion of having discovered something, and persist in shouting "Eureka!" to the world at large. But a closer contemplation of these, as a class, renders the common sense community even less disposed to follow them as leaders. There is a prejudice against accepting one as a guide who seems to have lost himself, or escaped from the precincts of a prudently imposed privacy, mentally unarrayed for company.

Yes, a change of environment is something, but it is not everything; is it enough? Certainly we do not need to stand under a water-spout when it rains; but will even umbrella and overcoat keep out the humidity, or stop the shower? Cleanliness may be akin to godliness; but is it father or mother, or a remote cousin; and can it ever grow into identity with its offspring? Like an attempt at making a five-inch stovepipe fit into a four-inch one, there is a mortifying failure by reason of sundry bulgings out wherever we have attempted sundry bulgings in. Our reservoir of common happiness is found leaky; as fast as we turn new springs into it, these leaks seem to gain upon us. We begin to suspect that we will have to scoop up the entire ocean, and find a place to keep it in, before we can have a dry hold in the ship of universal welfare as built in the yard of those eminent shipbuilders, the environment philosophers. Somehow, their vessels do not seem to have been intended for the ocean; like children's toys, the water takes all the paint off and despoils them of the fair looks they had in the shop-windows. Can it be that many of these theories were made only to be sold, and not to be applied!

All this is suspicious. If right, a theory ought to be practi-

cable; and if not practicable, how can it be right? It may not be wrong in every part; but it must be wrong in some part. Practicability is the answer set down in the book of nature. Whatever is in harmony with the laws of nature, will work; whatever "does not work" is out of keeping with the mechanism ordained and established and respected by the Creator of all things. It is clear that to rely solely, or even in chiefest part, upon an external change, a modification of surroundings, for the accomplishment of the things devoutly to be wished for, in society at large or in the individual in particular, is not a practical method, does not work out, cannot be in harmony with nature's laws, in some way crosses the lines of development marked out by the divine idea. Perhaps it would be well to ask what this divine idea is before we philosophize from self out? Can we evolve social salvation from our own inner consciousness or not? How stands this matter?

Here then, indeed, is the initial problem! What is the Divine Idea? What does God mean by this world, for us at least,—to ask nothing as to its meaning for the innumerable other beings and entities in it? Perchance I may find that a true statement of facts is not that the world is unsatisfactory, but that I am unsatisfying and, hence, unsatisfied. It may not be the environment, the "not me," that needs change so much as myself, my character, the "me." What would an angel care for this rain-storm that makes me so miserable! What part of the environment of a "ministering spirit" is rain, hail, tempest, drought, scorching heat or benumbing cold? Change my "correspondences," and you change my environment. It means no more than those things outside of me which can act upon me or be acted upon by me; and if my mode of activity, my character, be changed, then these things drop out of environment that were in it, and others take their place. The world is very much what we make it; much more than that we are what the world makes us, at all events. Hence it does look very much as though the right way to proceed in making the world better were to make ourselves what we ought to be rather than to begin with our surroundings. Which, then, is the true point of attack, character or environment? But what is the true character? What is Man?

This question brings us back to that other one with which the paragraph began : What is the Divine Idea ?

How shall we attain to it ? Shall we seek it out in its manifestation in external nature ? We call this the Cosmos, the thing designed, orderly, systematic ; what then does this design say of the designer ? It says a great many things, and some of them very hard to reconcile. It shows created things wherein wisdom and skill and benevolence seem to have vied with one another in the production of perfection ; but it shows also distorted things, malformations, birds that cannot fly, animals with disproportionate legs, and human beings humped and crooked, fingerless, deaf and dumb. What shall we say of these ? Has old Chaos a survival in the midst of created order ? Are these part of the order, the cosmic unity of plan ? Or do you say that from our limited standpoint we cannot see enough of the field to infer the whole design, and are judging of it as one would judge a great painting by the exposure of a square inch or two ? Or do you affirm that this is but the second volume of a work in three or more parts, and that we must wait until the end crowns that work before pronouncing a verdict ? Either way, it follows that only in some degree does nature voice the Divine Idea ; it is not far enough advanced to tell us all that we wish to know.

Yet in that degree in which it is advanced may we not, with modest diffidence, point to certain features always prominent ; may not the two or three points we have give us some limit as to the sweep of the circle ? Is there not a marked struggling, a persistence against adverse surroundings, a development resulting from such necessary vigor, indicated in all the forms of being that fills us with the fullest connection of design and higher life ? All of them seem to say, We must fight if we would reign ; we have fought, therefore we are regnant. Just as soon as we begin to cherish and fondle these forms of life, make household pets of them, hothouse flowers of them, take away the need of this struggle, then they fade and die without provocation. Pet gazelles, according to the old song, die off. To kill weeds, says a humorist, cultivate them like exotics.

Is the Divine Idea mirrored in our own being, our human con-

sciousness? Is it presumptuous for us to think we can evolve the Infinite out of our finite self? The question answers itself; we cannot by taking thought think out God. Subjective religions are false religions; the noblest of them only speak highly of their joint creators as having failed not without merit. Our consciousness of the spiritual is responsive rather than origina-tive; it feels the truth or falsehood of an appeal to it, but does not act before occasion stimulates its faculty. It is difficult to give a name indicative of the cause to a disease simply from having felt the pain as an effect. Diagnosis requires careful study and especial opportunities of verification, and, with all this, fails often enough in its verdict of cause made upon the evidence of symptoms.

But here again we may make rejoinder. To some degree, and modestly, we can tell of the Creator and his archetypal idea of man, we being men and conscious. We may not be clear as to many things, and yet may see our way fairly well as to some few. It may not appear what we are ultimately to become, and yet it may be clear that our way thither lies in the exercise of certain powers. Of that part which is clear, an appeal to experience assures us that the development of power is by its exercise upon or against that which resists. Neither can the bird fly nor the man swim without a resisting element. We cannot walk or stand firmly without the resisting and antagonizing force of gravitation. We do not will at all except when we must overcome this resistance to our desires. We row against the adverse current, we drift with the swift tide favoring us; and drifting does not develop muscle. An easy indulged childhood makes a weak manhood; woe to that land whose king is a child. Where the movements up and down in the social scale are free, how few remain at the top for three or four generations. When riches increase, virtues must increase with them, or both take their flight. It is a harder task to keep one's grandchild rich and respectable, than to become rich oneself.

If this is an unsatisfactory sort of world, its philosophy and science are very much the same. The more honest they are, the oftener they say, We do not know, We cannot tell. The splendor of their fragmentary success often obscures their fail-

ure as to complete possession. They have fought their way up through a difficult country well-nigh to within sight of the citadel; there they lie entrenched, but have been unable to advance any nearer. Sounds and signals are wafted over the intervening space; but we cannot make them out. We suspect, theorize, but cannot verify. We may make closer advances, but as yet we have not.

Is it to be wondered at that under all these circumstances the Christian turns to the Word, that which he believes to be a message sent by God to man, and questions it? With it in hand, he realizes that he has a clue; and, as a joint product of revelation and experience, he reads the way of life for himself, traces the road along which he must journey. What he is to do, is tolerably clear; what he is to become, is hidden beyond the sunset effulgence, too bright for distinct vision. What now is revealed? In part just what nature without and experience within made us suspect. There is to be a development; and that development is a growth against resisting forces, a constant battle in which every prisoner we take becomes a loyal soldier on our side. To him that hath, it is given; from him that hath not is taken away even that which he hath. The strong become stronger, and the weak, weaker; the rich, richer, and the poor, poorer. But these things which we see in the realm of this life are transferred to another realm. We are assured that the spiritual realm is the abiding one; the unspiritual, a mere transitory. We are warned, advised, assisted to shape ourselves for correspondence with the spiritual environment and withdraw from the material as delusive, perishing, already limited to brief duration.

See now what a difference this makes! The mere humanitarian is worried lest some one will own all the acres there are; the spiritual man smiles to think how that poor fool will cheat himself, gaining the whole world and losing his own soul. The environment enthusiast wants to repress every temptation, every inducement that makes errors possible; the Christian philosopher cannot but see that such a state, if attained, would check the growth of character, taking away, as it would, all the material upon which its growth depends. Whence could we ob-

tain a righteousness wrought out, if there were no wrong to refuse, no temptation to resist, no self-denial to persist in? The whole plan of probation, of faithful obedience, of sanctification, falls at once so soon as temptation no longer exists. Without temptation, there is no character!

Let us grant all that can be granted! The necessary remnant of resistance essential to this education of character is far less than the actual amount on hand. The word itself declares us to be in a fallen state, so fallen that without divine aid, atoning merit, as a fresh basis, our case were a hopeless one. We may do much therefore to improve the environment by removing all these excrescences. But the essential features will remain; we can never expect a perfectly sound state of the body social or politic. This world will never be a safe place for a characterless man; it was never meant to be so, upon the testimony both of experience and of revelation. Was salvation by grace an afterthought, the rectification of a blunder; or was it the divine idea from all eternity? Does the whole creation groan and travail even yet, or does it not? What are its misshapen monsters but object-lessons? Why was that man born blind? Why was it needed that God's glory should be thus exemplified?

But this work of conservative reformation needs a hand far more skillful and a head far more sensible than the amiable enthusiast's jumping at conclusions, mistaking occasions for causes, can bring to the task. God does not take short cuts. He will not pull up the wheat with the tares. Creation shows involved processes, causes turning their backs for a time upon the very effects they are to embrace, all sorts of seeming contradictions. We grow impatient, we cry, "Lord, how long!" But the Lord moves on, not slack concerning his promises, but yet as one with whom a thousand years are but as one day. Reformation of society must be conservative, it cannot be radical without pulling up order and disorder at once, for their roots are interlaced and intertwined.

"Then the devil taketh him up into the holy city, and setteth him on a pinnacle of the temple, and saith unto him, If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down!" Why not, O Son of the Blessed? Didst thou not already then behold thine own city,

with sure prophetic glance, beleaguered by the foe and the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place? Didst thou not foresee the great tribulation such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be? Could not the victims of famine, gnawing the bones of their own offspring melt thee to instant resolve? Couldst thou withstand the mute appeal of the crucified captives of that relentless warfare, the horrors of siege and faction? Oh! why didst thou not listen, not indeed to Satan, but to love, and cast thyself down? They would have believed, hailed thee as Messiah, escaped their doom, and thou thy cross of shame! Thou mightest have perished by loving reluctant hands as a pious sacrifice, adored, wept over, a most precious and avowed paschal lamb, still as effectually bearing the sins of the world, making an everlasting atonement! But he replies not to our importunity! We wonder, and are silent, and we can only read: "It is written again, thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." We may safely trust the ordinary forces of culture and civilization for the better environment; but we cannot trust them for the better character. The general progress of civilization is away from violence and injustice, upon the whole; men thrive better without them; they are mistakes as well as sins, injuries as well as impieties. We are frightened now and then by one of the old chaotic forms reappearing, but we soon find out that it is an iceberg drifting toward the equator. The orderly, the cosmical, has grown too strong by its battling with such monsters in the past to be conquered by them now. The danger is from within. Disease rather than violence is to be feared. Ancient civilizations perished by loss of life-force; when they lay already dying, their foes dismembered them. "They lost their national character, and their national degradation followed." But national character is simply an aggregate of individual characters.

The formation of a right character is, therefore, by far the most important matter. Some little good may come from improved external circumstances; but, after all, the tenants of the new house, if they retain their old characters, will soon find some other way to their old degradation. If they are to be held up all the while, what good is attained? Wherein do these char-

acterless beings eventually reach any salvation? This world was not meant for such, cannot be fitted to them, and they cannot, in discord with its requirements, rise to the satisfaction of the ideal set before them. Such are doomed helplessly. After all, we cannot work out other men's salvation for them; each one must work out his own. This is the bitter experience of those who strive and strive, only at last to wail in vain lament: "O, my son Absalom! my son, my son Absalom! would God I had died for thee, O Absalom, my son, my son!" For God has not so willed the laws of man's existence.

Again, with increasing civilization, while the question of environment becomes of less importance, more easily righting itself, the question of character becomes of greater importance. A civilized nineteenth century man needs a far better character than an uncivilized man of a thousand years ago. A man might have been quite respectable in King Alfred's reign who would be debarred from all good men's society under Queen Victoria's rule. Great inequalities were condoned then; history approves in general of those of whom she incidentally mentions lust and murder. She does not do that of contemporaries; let a man run for a public office, and he will verify the truth of this. "As thy day, so shall thy strength be," is as much a warning as a consolation. We can have strength for our day, we can have strength such as never has been; for all the opportunities are on hand for its acquisition. But we *must* have strength sufficient for our day as it is; and it is the day of most intense activity, the day of fiercest temptation, of greatest facility of downfall. We walk upon the heights, exalted in opportunity, exacting of capability; our training must be that of eagles, not of wood-doves.

The *occasion*, not the *cause*, of temptation is the inequality of condition. Property is the occasion of theft; the cause is the lack of a right character. Civilization is the multiplication of diversity in condition; and to an undeveloped, or wrongly developed, character this diversity always appears as inequality. We know the apparent ills of our lot, but we are apt to see only the apparent advantages of our neighbors. We realize the resisting medium's force by means of which we are rowing; but

we only see, as we think, that some other man has a better boat, a better pair of oars. What progress we could make if we had his boat and his oars! What right has he got to have them instead of our having them? Subjectively, therefore, and just as really in consequence for the characterless, every increase of civilization is an increase of temptation.

Yet for the characterful, if one may so call them, what abounding opportunities does this same diversity we call civilization present for growth—development in upward lines. It is the condition of diffused knowledge, of ready information, of accepting that phase of differentiation suitable to the individual taste and temperament. It brings the world close together for our mental food, or makes it safe for our far voyaging observation. It gives us time to live as intelligences, as spiritualities, instead of exacting the work of an entire day as the equivalent of scanty fare, dismal shelter, wretched apparel, a mere animal environment. Talk of the distinctions of classes, the artificial castes of society in our day! What are their burdens and heart-burnings compared to the simple distinction of yesterday's society into the two classes of those who killed and those who were killed! The good, old times, forsooth! Let us not quarrel with civilization, but agonize for character.

The most practical application of this discussion is in the sphere of education. Accepting the fact as a fact that we are born to battle against temptation, that we cannot rise without temptation but that we may just as readily fall by temptation, the one important feature of a true system of pedagogy must be the attention it gives to the development of a right character, rather than of mere accomplishments. The youth of our land must have character, good, sound, sturdy character. Whether they can dance or fence, speak foreign tongues or translate ancient classics, discuss philosophy or dabble in sciences, yea, even make money or barely support themselves, all these are trifles compared to the question, will their training foster a right character? What constitutes a state? Men! And what constitutes a man? Character! Is this the education of our

day, or is it not? Does that too fall into the fallacy of seeking only to improve the environment?

The charge is made against our public schools that they tend to disgust our youth with such employments as are rough, hand-soiling, necessitate ungainly dress, that they all wish to be gentlemen, enter the professions, and the like. This, if true, would be saying that they are taught to seek a more pleasant environment. But we doubt whether statistics will bear out this charge. There is a graver charge against our educating, from which the home is no more exempt than the school, and in which the higher institutions are equally involved, the charge that the tendency all through is to exalt wealth, material wealth, which is but an environment, and mere accomplishments, as conducive to the same end too often, above all care for character or thought of it. The result is summed up in the saying: Get money; honestly, if you can; but, at all events, get it.

Character is not born into the world; but the lack of it is. It does not harden and crystallize for a score of years; but it is tending to its own peculiar angle of crystallization all the while. What that will be, depends upon factors, and that one which we call education, training by precept and discipline, is not the least among them. It begins with imitation of others as models; it catches at the tone of the society in which it moves; it is quick to discern that which all men desire; it is impressible to the divine and the devilish. In the few, it shapes itself by its own native vigor, for good or evil, despite surroundings of home, friends, educators, social tendencies; in the many, it is seriously modified by these in its formative period. With the many, therefore, education is a dominant factor.

But where does this educating, positively and purposively, take place? At home? The home shifts the burden upon the school. At school? The school retorts by shifting all but the intellectual training back upon the home. But at all events it is done in the Church? The church gives from twenty to thirty minutes to positive instruction once a week, providing that the child comes, or the parents send it, supplemented, in some cases by a single course of a few months, an hour or so each week. How is it in the college, in the workshop, in the store? The

latter ones do not pretend to do such work; the former one, as represented by our "larger colleges," solemnly repudiates any such responsibility. Where then does our educational method provide adequately for character building? Alas! nowhere. Hence the too frequent results. Indirectly, negatively, it does something for it; but positively, deliberately, not much. The home example is indirectly much; the school discipline is something; the services of God's house, if attended, are still more; yet there is an assumption, a foundation, underneath it all that the child has a character already and needs only a little assistance to keep it from losing it.

Parental anxiety is far greater as to the accomplishments. "How is my boy getting along?" usually means an inquiry as to his standing in class. Tell this fond parent of delinquencies in character, and he excuses them as mere coltishness, or ignores them; discipline the boy, and the blame is put upon the other boys, or the teacher! Bad company is the explanation. But how did the company become bad? What made it congenial? To go back to philosophical phraseology, whence came the correspondences with this evil environment? "To the pure, all things are pure," for they have no senses open to the impure.

Undoubtedly, home is the place above all others for the first and most important processes of character upbuilding. It is so because the foundations are laid in those earliest years of life when home is the child's world. It is so because the superstructure depends for stability and grandeur upon the foundation. When God has made one a parent, he has made him or her, for neither is to be exempted, a teacher. The family is a divine institution; woe to the household, and the nation, when it forgets its duty! But the school is also a place for character building; and woe to the nation whose schools teach everything but true manhood and womanhood. Above all, the Church should heed the admonition to train up her children in the way in which they should go, and watch with anxious eye their progress.

But how about our "higher institutions" of learning? Is their theory, or, rather, the theory of some of them, that the age of their students renders them masters of themselves, and relieves the university, or college, of all concern except for their intel-

lectual training, a sound one? "Without temptation," no such gathering of young men can be. But should the already characterless be permitted to frequent them? Has the line been drawn, at that age, once for all? Are there not many unformed as yet, pliable, plastic, just hardening, whether by good or evil impression? We believe there are, and deny the plea that these schools should be indifferent to vice, extravagance, rowdyism, irreligion, or suffer these to reign unchecked and set the fashion of the day. Read the columns of our daily papers, their college or sporting news, for one seems to be identical with the other, and note their contents as they bear upon the building up of character. Are these our "*higher*" institutions?

"The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom;" it is the continuance of it, and the consummation also. "We should so fear and love God" is the cement that alone makes the foundation of character strong enough to bear up under the stress and storm of temptation that will, that must, blow upon it. There is no motive of human pride or selfishness or love that can take the place of this. Refined knowledge may understand the results of crime, but is no whit stronger to resist the plausible devil that tells how we may sin without being discovered. Accomplished manners and elegant address may gloss wickedness with euphemistic phrase and call it by other titles, but all this is but painting rotten wood to look like bronze or iron. Philosophy may spin a web of sophistical theory and demonstrate to its heart's content that sin is not sin, and yet its votary will die the death of a sinner just as surely. Men cannot cheat God by rising early or toiling late. He has made our life to consist in a constant battling with temptation in order that we, by overcoming, may be excited to nobler living and made capable of higher being; he has affixed the penalty of degradation upon all who refuse to strive or supinely yield. Without temptation, we cannot be; but with character, modeled upon the divine lines and resting upon mediatorial merit, without temptation we would not be. Without the battle, with all its danger of deadly wounds and disastrous defeat, we can win no victory; and without the victory, we cannot be crowned.

ARTICLE VI.

THE SUNDAY NEWSPAPER: AN ARRAY OF OPINIONS
AGAINST IT.

By REV. P. C. CROLL, A. M., Schuylkill Haven, Pa.

Until recently the Sunday newspaper has been only an American and a continental European infliction, if not affliction. Now that dashing, enterprising journalist at the head of the *New York Herald*, James Gordon Bennett, has succeeded in introducing it also into England by having an edition of his Sunday sheet published in London. This innovation occasioned sufficient stir to waken again the apparently slumbering question of the Sunday press. Because of the revival of discussion on this topic, I have here brought together a chorus of voices, whose united opposition we trust may do something towards driving these secular dailies from polluting our homes on the Lord's day. The temporary silence on this subject by the Church is no evidence, therefore, that the Christian conscience has changed, or that the opponents to the Sunday paper have been won over to it. Until the Sunday paper shall itself have been reformed and transformed into a messenger of holy and uplifting intelligences this change cannot take place. The Christian public may tolerate it as an unavoidable evil, and the great newspaper-publishing corporations, for the sake of pecuniary profit, may go on for a while in their conscienceless method of creating and supplying such a created public demand, yet we believe that opposing sentiment is growing and that a wholesome reform is coming, if this class of literature be not wholly exterminated. As yet the character of these publications is too low, too secular, too sensational, too namby-pamby to merit the patronage of conscientious Christian men. Its constant reading will certainly vitiate the literary taste, secularize the mind and rob the heart of its holiest influences and sweetest peace on the Sabbath day. It is therefore an enemy to God, whose commandments it transgresses; an enemy to the Church, where it stealthily seeks to

sow tares, and an enemy to the soul, which it would feed on husks and engross with its secularism. Of course the press will be slow to believe this, since it arrogates to itself the exalted position of being the world's chief educator and uplifter. It loves to boast of its elevating influence and its almost omnipotent power. Whilst we are inclined to concede to it vast influence, the standard of morality of its average Sunday issues we think, must be greatly changed or it will take a great many long centuries before the morning light of the millennium will brighten our moral heavens. The argument that it is better companionship than the club-house or the bar-room, or even the public-garden, will not suffice; for it engrosses the mind, robbing it of that best boon to man—a day of sacred rest and change and release from the imperious demands of worldly rivalry and business competition. Until, therefore, the Sunday newspaper can give its readers such release, and bring visions of the home and life beyond, rather than the accounts of fashion, of sport, of crime and of the hard-beaten path of earth's plodding sons and daughters here below, it is a usurper of God's holiest time, a robber of man's noblest rights and a seducer to a narrow and dusty life. As it is, I have never heard of a single life that its pages have exalted into greater usefulness or fidelity to man or into closer likeness with God. But I shall here introduce others and let them speak their sentiments of opposition.

The religious press has, as with one voice, spoken against the publishing of a Sunday edition of our secular dailies. The following extracts show us their sentiments, taking only a few as specimens:

The *Congregationalist* sets forth the damaging character of its influence in these words:

"Probably nothing else has helped on the misuse of the Sabbath, the neglect of the house of God, and hindered the progress of the Church and religious work, so much as the Sunday newspaper."

The *N. Y. Christian Advocate* uses the following strong language against it:

"It is often the first step in the religious ruin of a family to let it in—many have lost the whole life of piety by it. It means

no Bible read, no religious conversation, no prayer or meditation."

The *Christian Intelligencer* in referring to the temptations held out by these journals to week-day readers to purchase their Sunday editions, says:

"The Sunday newspaper is made the most attractive number of the week, stories, engaging incidents, attractive events in social life, interesting personals, striking facts from all departments of life, papers on topics of general and special interest, are gathered or solicited for days beforehand in order to allure men to buy the paper. On Friday the glowing and tempting advertisements of the Sunday sheet begin. On Saturday they are repeated; and this is to sell the paper. The desire to make money out of traffic on God's day prompts the make-up and the publication of the Sunday number of the daily newspapers."

The *Lutheran Observer* arraigns and convicts the Sunday paper of moral guilt, according to the style of criminal jurisprudence on five separate counts of indictment, viz.: 1. The illegitimacy of its origin. 2. The criminality of its business. 3. The deception and wrong it practices on its old subscribers. 4. Its discrimination in favor of the irreligious portion of the community and its offensiveness to the Christian consciousness of the nation. 5. Its debauching of the national conscience and corruption of public opinion. Then in another issue the same paper continues its accusations thus:

"The Sunday newspaper is the progeny of infidelity and the mammon of unrighteousness. It dethrones Jehovah as law-giver, and sets at naught the commandment of God: 'Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.' * * It saps the foundations of Christianity, and fosters infidelity. The Sabbath is a distinguishing feature of Christianity, and any agency that destroys reverence for it as a divine institution, and interferes with its observance as a holy day, undermines it, and inoculates all whom it can influence by its opinions and practice with the leaven of skepticism. The Sunday newspaper does this more effectually than any other instrumentality of its class. * * It is rapidly transforming the American Sabbath into the Continental holiday. * * If its unlawful and corrupting work is

permitted to go on unchecked it will, in a decade or two, transform New York, Chicago, Cincinnati and St. Louis into the likeness of Berlin and Paris on Sunday, and in a single generation exorcise from the minds of the American people their traditional veneration for the Sabbath and Franco-Germanize the nation.

"The Sunday newspaper is the devotee of mammon, and the despoiler of the poor. * * It is an audacious pretender, and insidious tempter to the unwary, and the destroyer of souls. * * By crowding their Sunday issues with double or treble the amount of matter contained in any of their week-day editions they ensnare the irreligious; and by sprinkling them with some items of religious news to sanctify the whole sheet, they entrap nominal and worldly-minded professors of religion, who are not troubled with enlightened consciences, and are easily tempted to follow a multitude in profaning the holy Sabbath. * * The reading and digesting of such a mass of secular matter as the extra twelve or sixteen-page Sunday paper contains, will occupy most of the Sabbath, secularize the mind, harden the heart, sear the conscience, blast the character, and ruin the soul."

The *Illustrated Christian Weekly* a few years since analyzed a current Sunday issue of the quintupled, twenty-paged *New York Herald*. It showed that into such enormous space—though about half of it was filled with advertisements—was crowded as much reading matter as 250 pages of "Uncle Tom's Cabin," or 400 pages of Stanley's "Congo," or 157 pages of the Bible (Teacher's Edition, Minion 8vo.), an equivalent of reading matter to that found from the beginning of Genesis to the fifteenth chapter of the book of Numbers, or in the New Testament, through the Gospels, together with very nearly the whole of the Acts. Then it shows up the quality of the reading matter to be utterly unfit for religious edification or even moral and intellectual profit, and then concludes as follows:

"Now we say that, to put it in the mildest form, the Christian deliberately puts himself in the way of temptation who admits this monster sheet (we refer to size and not to character in the word) to his house. In the first place, and this alone ought to condemn it, the Sunday newspaper, little or big, secularizes

the whole day. It brings the thoughts of the world, the cares and business of the world, into the hours that ought to be devoted to God. And when we add quantity to this evil quality, what chance is there for the sacredness of the day to be recovered by him who has begun it by 'looking through' the pages of this blanket sheet? What sort of a preparation for the services of God's house or for the tender joys of a pious home in its Sabbath blessedness is the 'looking through' of four columns and a-half concerning theatres and actors, or six columns of gossip about various summer resorts, or again six columns of sporting intelligence? Will it nerve one for the Christian conflict to read a column and more about a pugilistic encounter? Will it set the mind more firmly on the treasures in heaven to 'look through' three columns of matter about the rise and fall of stocks and the like? * * We do hope that Christian men will come to see the harm that must accrue to themselves and their households by their admitting to their homes the Sunday newspaper."

The *Augsburg Teacher* for March 1886 says:

"Our Christian institutions are the bulwark of our national liberties and the Christian Sabbath is the keystone of their foundation arch. Now there is nothing that will more insidiously and surely wear away and destroy this stone than the publishing on Sunday of a secular newspaper, with all the necessities and resorts developed by such publication. Everybody with any intelligence knows that our opposition to these papers is not that they are printed on Sunday (for, of course, they are not) but because they are published and read on Sunday, tending mightily to completely *secularize* the day. Better, a thousand times, that they were all printed on Sunday than that they should be published and read on that day. If things be so, what is a Christian's duty? Why certainly neither to take the Sunday papers nor encourage those publishers who issue them."

The same journal quotes the Rev. Dr. Charles H. Parkhurst from a quotation in the *New York Observer* of a recent sermon of his on "The Lord's Day," as follows:

"I am convinced that there is no influence to-day that is operating with greater rapidity to saturate the Sunday air with

secularism and wipe out the distinctions that have hitherto obtained between the one day and the six days than our Sunday morning newspapers. I can conceive of a Sunday journal so made up that it would be an exceedingly delicate question to decide whether on the whole it would promote Sabbatical ideas and habits or discourage them. But on a recent Sunday, with this subject pressing on my mind, I procured a copy each of what I believe are the six leading Sunday morning issues, and made an analysis of them column by column and paragraph by paragraph, and I confess to you that the result filled me with surprise, chagrin and alarm.

"First was *The Morning Journal*, secular, of course, and nasty as ever, with seven illustrations, which, if sensually contemplated would cauterize the soul as with hell-hot iron.

"Then came *The Sun*, without any obscene pictures to be sure, but just as distinctly and whole-heartedly secular from date to finish as a circus or a bull-fight.

"The next was *The Herald*, containing half a column and thirty-two lines over that were at least suggestive of the day on which it was issued, but out of its 144 columns, somewhat more than a solid half was devoted purely and exclusively to advertisements, with the rest made up, as it is always made up, of politics, horse-racing, murders, suicides, finance, and a tincture of literary criticism.

"Then came *The World*. Really I found nothing in *The World* that would have been inappropriate in a week-day issue. Out of its 224 columns 173 were devoted to advertisers, which is a pretty good test of the unadulterated secularity of its entire animus. On that day its issue amounted to 225,000 copies, which, according to its own representation of the case, would, if stacked up as it came from the press, each paper folded once, make a pile higher than the Bartholdi Statue, the Washington Monument, the Cologne Cathedral, the Pyramid of Cheops, St. Peter's in Rome, St. Paul's in London, Notre Dame in Paris, Bunker Hill Monument, and Old Trinity in New York—a stack higher than all of those piled one on top of the other. That was the amount of printed unmixed secularism that *The World* distributed one Sunday in December. And if 225,000 men

bought it, probably at least twice that number of men read it. That was the Sunday pabulum of well-nigh half a million of men. What do you calculate to be the effect of that kind of influence in the direction of undermining and honey-combing the American Sabbath?

"Next in order was *The Times*, an improvement on *The World* of course: less advertising, and, putting on it a liberal construction, containing well on toward one per cent. of matter that stood in a kind of sympathy with the resurrection day of our Lord Jesus Christ.

"Last was *The Tribune*. It is rather natural for each man to expect that the paper which he himself ordinarily reads will easily eclipse its contemporaries; and therefore when I turned the pages of that Sunday issue of *The Tribune* I anticipated that my shaken confidence in Sunday journalism would be measurably reassured. Setting aside one article which was in the tone of a good-natured caricature of all the religious sects, out of the ninety-six columns that composed the issue there were nine lines that had about them a religious and Sabbatical suggestion. It was something about somebody's preaching down in Broome street. We may or may not agree with that paper's politics; we probably esteem its book reviews and art criticisms; we certainly rejoice in its moral cleanliness. But for all that, every time that it pours out upon the community such an issue by the tens and scores of thousands, and does it on Sunday, it is so much heavy ordnance trained on the Sabbath, that grand bulwark of Christian civilization, and puts only so much added tax upon the Church in its efforts to destroy the devil and all his works."

In harmony with the religious press the *representatives of the great Christian denominations*, in conventions assembled, have, at different times, joined their mighty voices in strong opposition to the Sunday paper. So have the great reform associations of the world. We can but quote the language of a few. The *National W. C. T. U.*, in a leaflet on Sabbath Desecration, says: "The Sunday newspaper has proved itself the worst foe of the Sabbath in any home it enters." In another leaflet on the special topic of the Sunday paper, prepared by Mrs. J. C. Bateman,

the Supt. of this department of the work, this union indicts the Sunday newspaper as a foe to the Sabbath, the Church, the home and our country, on the following thirteen counts: "1. It displaces the Bible and religious reading, diverts the mind from appropriate Sabbath themes and unfits it for serious thought and worship. 2. It displaces rest of brain and nerve. 3. It fills the mind with business, politics, fashions, amusements, and especially crimes, all which should be shut out one day in seven and the mind centered on better things. 4. It puts religion and the world on the same level, nullifies the sacred influence of the Lord's Day and tends to paralyze Christian activity. 5. The example of Christian men who patronize these sheets, sows broadcast the seeds of worldliness and infidelity, and the young people are led thereby into loose views and practice. 6. It demoralizes the Christian family and raises an immeasurable barrier against the entrance of religious thought and feeling into unconverted families, and it is doing this in millions of the homes of our land. 7. It compels Sabbath labor, and thus violates God's law, which allows no work save that of necessity and mercy. 8. It is purely a money-making scheme, was never started to fill a want, but to make money, reckless of consequences. 9. Its moral tone is low despite its religious corner. 10. Except where legislation has been secured in their favor, the printing and sale of newspapers violate state laws forbidding 'common labor and traffic on Sunday.' Worse still, it is the entering wedge for all traffic on Sunday. 11. It often requires extra Sunday trains and extra work of post-offices and makes a close triumvirate of the three great foes—the Sunday train, Sunday mail service and Sunday newspapers, making it doubly hard to dislodge either of the others. 12. Since Sunday newspapers themselves disregard the Lord's day they naturally uphold other Sabbath-breakers, and hence countenance Sunday excursions and amusements, and whatever tends to give us an infidel Sunday, and this throws the weight of nearly every daily of the country on the side of lawlessness and immorality. 13. All who make or support these journals violate God's command to 'Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy,' and are responsible for its violation by millions more, and are exposing us to

God's curse pronounced upon the nation that will not obey God nor regard his Sabbaths.

"To sum up, the Sunday newspaper is an enemy. It violates the laws of the land and of God, condemns hundreds of thousands to steady grinding toil, draws in its train nearly all forms of Sabbath desecration, and threatens us with the curse of God. It is a cunning device of Satan to deaden the consciences and paralyze the activities of Christians, to neutralize the blessed Sabbath influence and ruin souls."

The *World's Sabbath Observance Prayer Union*, composed of representatives from all Christendom, in its annual call to a week of prayer for April 1887, published in fourteen different languages, sets forth the following as the second great topic for prayer, endorsed by similar societies in this country:

"That the editors of the secular press may be led to use their great influence in favor of the sacred keeping of the Lord's day. The power of the press is immense, and it is deeply to be regretted that this power is so largely employed against the Sabbath. Prayers should ascend that conductors of the press should cease to create the large amount of labor that is now carried on in many of their printing offices on the Lord's day."

Quite an array of *individual opinions*, opposed to the issue of a Sunday newspaper may be drawn up, and yet no one would dare to characterize these men as narrow-minded or as bigots. They have been always regarded as among the foremost of our liberal-minded, progressive and broad-viewed thinkers.

Twenty-five years ago Horace Greely said to Dr. Cuyler: "Six daily papers a week can be prepared in six days without infringing on the working man's lawful day of rest; but seven days a week require seven days' work and break down the Sunday." The editor of the Cincinnati *Gazette*, before commencing the Sunday issue said: "To a hundred thousand printers, the Sunday issue of the newspaper makes all days alike with no semblance of rest. * * One need not be a Puritan to feel that Sunday should be restricted to elevating, humanizing and restful reading; to this class current news does not belong."

Col. John W. Forney gives his impressions of the desecrated Sabbath in Paris, which he visited some years ago, in a letter to

his paper, *The Philadelphia Press*. After describing what he saw of theatres, horse-racing and various other amusements advertised in the Sunday journals of that city, he added: "And this is Paris on Sunday. When the degradation of that day of rest is completed, and it is dishonored in America as it is here, freedom will have gone from us forever." What a comment that this should be the first editor in Philadelphia to introduce the Sunday paper, and that the great journal which he founded should now, with others, be busy, every Lord's day of the year, in attempts to transform the American into a Parisian Sabbath!

Joseph Cook, in one of his Boston Monday Lectures, delivered Feb. 15, 1886, said of the Sunday newspaper the following: "I should not be so much in earnest concerning the breaches made in our Sunday laws by the Sunday newspapers and their distribution, if I did not remember how important it is to resist the beginnings in the letting out of a flood. The Sunday newspaper is a cray-fish in the dikes of misrule; a cray-fish that undermines the banks behind which the race courses,—the theatres, the saloons, the brothels, the gambling dens are roaring for exit. * * This is what Sunday is for: to bring us up and up to the summit of our natures, until we behold God, and, by looking into his face, are changed into the same image, from glory to glory. A man must be living a very bewildered or empty life, who is fifty or sixty years of age and is not dressing his soul for a marriage feast, is not looking on to the hour when he must go hence. News from this world! One day in seven I want news of another world; for I go hence, and a seventh portion of my time is none too much to be used as a rudder for an eternity."

Canon Farrar, on his last visit to America, declared that "he was astounded at the corruptness of the American press, and found the chief exemplification of it in the Sunday journals."

Dr. Wilbur F. Crafts, author of "The Sabbath for Man" likens readers who excuse themselves for patronizing Sunday journals by saying that there is important religious news in them, to the boy who fished on Sunday, hour after hour, and excused himself by saying that always, before the fish began to bite, he took pains to whistle one of the Moody and Sankey hymns. Mr. Foxcroft, the accomplished literary editor of the Boston

Journal, after showing the very small percentage of religious intelligence in the average Sunday journal, says: "A Sunday newspaper does not print its ninety columns of base-ball, summer correspondence, and secular news and gossip in order that it may reach and evangelize the masses with its four columns of religious or quasi-religious articles. These latter are simply the tribute which is paid to a respect for Sunday, not yet extinct in New England; and they are expected to radiate a degree of sanctity over the copious remainder of the sheet, which remainder is heartily given up to the world, not to say the flesh and the devil,"

James Russell Lowell calls the average news in our journals "a goose-pond of village gossip"—a bath in which can but prove a poor preparation for Church. Dr. Howard Crosby and the session of his Church, some time ago issued a circular to the members of his congregation on the evil effects of Sunday newspapers, from which we quote the following: "We have seen with great sorrow the entrance of the Sunday newspaper into Christian families, and having witnessed the unhappy results of this admission, are desirous of warning you against this growing evil. * * There is no influence more insidiously seductive than this, for the demoralization of our Christian households * * It unfits the mind for serious thought, draws it away from God's word and nullifies all sacred influences of the Lord's day. The mind thus led becomes filled with thoughts on business, politics, games, theatres and crimes (which form the staple of newspaper literature), at the time when the Lord calls us especially to consider the things that belong to our higher spiritual welfare. No Christian can yield to such an influence without deadening his piety, chilling his faith, and destroying his usefulness." Sir Walter Scott, that old wizard of the North, speaking of the value of an unbroken and undiminished day of rest opposes all secular intrusions when he says: "Give the world one-half of Sunday, and you will find that religion has no strong hold on the other half."

A few years ago the New York *Star* collected the views of a large number of prominent clergymen of various denominations as to the influence of secular newspapers published on Sunday.

Whilst the opinions thus collated differ, some seeing no or little evil in these publications, others regretting only the character of their contents, and plead for their purification and reformation rather than their extermination and abolition, yet the vast majority of those consulted, and such as have never had their orthodoxy on other topics questioned, are of the decided conviction that the fact of these Sunday papers should be deplored and their spread strenuously opposed. We will conclude this article by quoting a number of these outspoken opinions in opposition to the Sunday press. The extracts are abbreviated from fuller expressions contained in the issue for Feb. 17, 1886, of the above-named journal :

Archbishop Gibbons, Roman Catholic, Baltimore : It is my impression and belief that the issuance and sale of Sunday newspapers are calculated, to a very serious extent, to weaken the religious quiet and solemnity of the Lord's day. I think, therefore, that it is a hurtful institution and one that has not God and truth on its side.

Rev. R. Heber Newton, Episcopal, New York : I do not recommend Sunday newspaper reading as the best mode of mental occupation of the day by any means.

Rev. A. P. Peabody, D. D., Harvard College : A Sunday newspaper which contained gossip, police reports, details of crime or materials to the taste of persons of a prurient imagination would do more mischief than would result from a week-day paper of a like character, as the readers have time to brood over its contents.

From *Congregational* Pastors : Rev. Geo. F. Pentecost, D. D., Brooklyn, N. Y. : "It is bad enough to have the mind and eye persecuted with the volume of filth that invades, I think, unnecessarily and shamelessly, the columns of our daily papers during the week time, without having it served up again on the Sabbath."

Rev. Theodore D. Woolsey, D. D., LL. D., New Haven, Conn : "If Sunday newspapers brought many into Christian assemblies, this might be a very good thing. But they (readers) will rather be alienated from the Church of God than be drawn to it the longer such a kind of life continues."

Rev. E. P. Roe, Cornwall-on-Hudson, N. Y: "I do not approve of publishing week-day papers on Sunday."

Rev. N. Everett Smith, Brooklyn, N. Y: "I have never encouraged the reading of Sunday newspapers, and do not indulge in it myself. Christian and intelligent people can employ their time to better advantage on that day."

Rev. Emory J. Haynes, Boston, Mass: "It has weight with me that the immense majority of the most devoted Christians gravely condemn the Sunday newspaper. In my church these are not the vociferous, the excitably zealous; they are the truly humble before the Bible, the prayerful the strictly conscientious, the conservative standbys."

Rev. Washington Gladden, D. D., Columbus: "It is about the only chance that many have to read and it is melancholy to think of dawdling these hours away over the average Sunday newspaper."

Rev. Mark Hopkins, D. D., Williams College: "I do not believe that any man or corporation will gain anything in the long run and on the whole by appropriating to a selfish use the time that belongs to God."

Rev. J. Hyatt Smith, Brooklyn: "God gave a seventh portion of every week to man and beast as a day of rest and I don't think it is the prerogative of man to change the benevolent enactment."

Rev. Edward P. Ingersoll, D. D., Brooklyn: "The design of the Sabbath is spiritual. Our Sunday papers are not and do not claim to be spiritual. The man who reads his paper and then hurries to church goes with his brain scratched all over with pictures that are not helpful to devout worship."

Rev. Lyman Abbott, D. D., editor *Christian Union*: "I do not believe in the Sunday newspaper, not because it gives some work to editors, compositors and newsboys—for the Monday newspaper creates more work than the Sunday newspaper—but because it brings the current of week-day life into the Sabbath."

Rev. Henry M. Scudder, D. D., Chicago: "The Sunday newspaper is, in my opinion, one of the most potent of the agencies

which tend to secularize the Christian Sabbath and thus to demoralize our nation."

Rev. Alex. M'Kenzie, D. D., Cambridge: "I judge from what I am told of the Sunday paper, for I do not read it. It would hurt my Sunday. I might do worse than read it. I can easily do better."

Rev. Edwin B. Webb, D. D., Boston: "I advise my congregation strongly not to read the Sunday papers."

From *Baptist* pastors:

Rev. Wayland Hoyt, D. D., Philadelphia: "I cannot express my sense of the moral injury which is being done by the fact that so large a part of the respectable press—that agency of such untold and pervasive influence—is allowing itself to be so widely married to Sabbath desecration."

Rev. Robert Lowry, D. D., Brooklyn: "So far as the Sunday paper tends to secularize the public mind, it is to be deplored."

Rev. Henry M. Gallagher, D. D., Essex, Conn.: "For my part I wish the managers of our newspapers would agree to revoke their Sunday issue, and for these reasons: 1. It detains some people from the morning services of churches which they might be likely to attend, and is, without intending it, the most effective rival of the pulpit. 2. It employs through the forenoon of Sundays many persons in labor which is not always a work of necessity. 3. It turns aside the mind and distracts the attention of churchgoing people from the best observance of the day of rest."

From *Methodist* Pastors:

Rev. W. P. Corbit, Brooklyn: "Honest Christians should never read a single line of a paper printed or published on the Lord's day, for any such is an avowed enemy to the Christian Church."

Rev. J. E. Cookman, New York: "The example and precept of publishing, buying or selling the Sunday newspaper is hurtful and demoralizing."

Rev. John Parker, Jamaica, L. I.: "In a pastorate of more than thirty years and a wide observation in many places I have not yet found a person who habitually reads the Sunday newspapers whose religious life has been in any respect a success."

From *Dutch Reformed* and *Presbyterian* Pastors: "Rev. E. S. Porter, Dutch Reformed, Claverack, N. Y.: "Read the Sermon on the Mount and the fifth chapter of the epistle of James and beware of the coming vengeance."

Rev. S. A. Mutchmore, D. D., Presbyterian, Philadelphia: "If religion is anything better than social decency, if it commands the moral nature to abstract itself ever from temptation, the present Sunday paper will not help it."

From *Independent* and other pastors:

Rev. Prof. David Swing of Chicago, says: "The actual *de facto* Sunday paper may well be rated as an evil. I have often attempted to make an argument in its favor, but the effort has never been satisfactory to my reasoning faculty."

Rev. F. D. Power, Campbellite, Washington: "Its whole aim and effect, as at present conducted, are out of harmony with the day and its purposes."

Rev. O. B. Frothingham, D. D., Independent, Boston: The burden of my objection to Sunday newspapers is that, as now conducted, they encourage the vulgar taste for trivial personalities, gossip, jokes, stories, cheap incidents, worthless bits of travel, the doings of insignificant people, items of petty but amusing intelligence."

Rev. F. G. Peabody, D. D., Harvard College: "For a rational man to occupy the best hours of so precious a day with the material provided for him by the Sunday newspaper is as if he should choose to spend his evenings at some belated session of a police court, with its foulness of air and of company, when there was waiting for him the peace and restfulness of his home.

ARTICLE VII.

BENEFICIARY EDUCATION.*

By REV. S. J. TAYLOR, A. M., Lock Haven, Pa.

Beneficiary Education as applied to the ministry of the Gospel, has been, is now, and will be for years to come, a subject of deep interest, not only to the Lutheran Church but to the whole church of Jesus Christ. For this reason the subject is still discussed in ecclesiastical assemblies and the church papers.

The writer has not heard nor does he expect to live to hear the last word on the subject. For, though it be clearly demonstrated that the theory or principle upon which Beneficiary Education rests is scriptural, yet there will always be more or less friction in its application to the needs of the Church. This would not be the case were man a less variable quantity.

Nor are the alternations between success and failure that have marked the pathway of Beneficiary Education adequately explained by the defects in man's character or human depravity. Unquestionably one of the causes of this varying progress lies in the fact that many who are called to legislate for the Church on the subject are not satisfied that Beneficiary Education is scriptural and therefore, correct in principle. Until the Church is satisfied that the principle is right and has attained to clear convictions on the subject, all church legislation on the subject will be tentative and, like all tentative legislation, more or less defective.

We will first examine the principle and then prove its soundness by the fruit it has borne.

Being more particularly concerned about the principle than its application to the exigencies of the Church we pass by several scripture passages which have done good service on this subject, such as Paul's warning to his spiritual son Timothy to "lay

*Delivered at the Loysville convention of the Central Penn'a Synod, and published by request.

hands suddenly upon no man," or the admonition of the apostles by Christ when he said: "Pray ye, therefore, the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth laborers into his harvest." Both these passages are in a measure pointless because, *first*, the church's educational exchequer is always so depleted that she is not likely to hurry any man unprepared into the holy office of the ministry; and, *second*, judging from the number of applicants, it does not appear that the Lord of the harvest is slack in sending forth laborers but that the Church is slack in equipping them for their work. Hence, if there be any real lack of ministers, Rom. 15 : 27—"And their debtors they are;" or, not to change scripture nor its application, but the time and place of it—and their debtors you (the church) are, seems to place the axe at the root of the right tree and fix the responsibility.

The circumstances of the text were about these: Paul was about to take up his journey to Jerusalem. He would carry with him the contributions of the Macedonian and Achaian Christians for the poor saints at Jerusalem. These gifts were forwarded to the Jewish Christians by the Gentiles with pleasure. And well might they, says the apostle, for they are in debt to the Christian Jews at Jerusalem.

The language of the apostle in the text reveals to us and all men the relative value of things temporal and things spiritual, placing the spiritual interests of man far above the temporal. For this reason the disciples of the Lord Christ are *always* under obligations to the kingdom of grace to the extent of *its* needs and *their ability* to meet these needs. Unquestionably the obligation of believers arising from the disparity in value between things temporal and spiritual is the ground or basis upon which Paul rests this declaration respecting the indebtedness of the Macedonian and Achaian Christians to the Christian Jews at Jerusalem.

This is undoubtedly true, for there is no other assignable reason for the debtorship of the Gentile Christians to the Christians at Jerusalem. The Macedonian and Achaian Christians were at no time saved from death by the sword, or succored in time of famine or pestilence by the saints at Jerusalem. Nothing of the kind. They only knew that it was from this church

at Jerusalem that the gifts of salvation came to them. This gift of itself and alone is the greater benefaction which places the recipients under an obligation to requite by sharing their carnal things when needed. The recipients of a saving knowledge of Jesus Christ are under a debt to those who have brought them to Christ that never can be discharged, and such persons should deem it a privilege, when within their power, to render any lower benefaction in return. I use the word lower in the sense of less value and advisedly. For in 1 Cor. 9 : 11, St. Paul says: "If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we should reap your carnal things?" That is to say: We who have sown unto you the infinitely more precious treasures of the Holy Spirit, may we not claim in return as a small recompense the only thing you have to give—a share in those things that nourish the flesh. Thus according to Scripture those who are saved by the Gospel are under a life-long obligation to its author, its appointed teachers and its needy poor.

But I am reminded that it is neither concerning the needs of the divinely appointed teachers nor the needy poor, except so far as they have imposed this poverty on themselves, that I am to speak, but concerning those who are preparing for the office of teacher. Is this not, however, making a distinction without a difference between the one proclaiming and the one preparing to proclaim the word of God. Both being called of God to the ministry of his word which of the two, the one now actually proclaiming divine truth, or the one developing his powers and seeking the mastery of them in order that he may honor God in an efficient proclamation of the same—which of these two is about his Master's business and which is not? Or, are they both? If both, are they not both equally entitled to that recompense which will supply their need? Evidently so, for the ground of their necessity is the same. As the ordained minister has let go of all secular employments that he may devote all his time and powers to the work of his holy office and the good of his fellow-men, so has the candidate for the holy ministry. He has made the same sacrifice and for the same purpose.

Is there not a difference, however, between these two classes of persons and our obligations, notwithstanding? In the case of

the ordained minister the necessities of his office have created his needs. Then he has either brought us to Christ or is leading us into a fuller relationship with him; and God has said: Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn—Deut. 25 : 14. But in the case of the indigent young man, the desire for the ministerial office has created his needs, and they are, therefore, self-imposed. Wherein lies our debtorship to him?

This question is pressed for answer either because your view respecting the origin of his necessities and the supposed range of your obligations are too narrow; or, because of a desire to do as little for the Lord and his needy ones as you can, instead of doing as much as you can. As the debtorship of these Gentile Christians of Macedonia and Achaia was not confined to the personal needs of God's messenger (Paul) to them but extended to the necessities, (though these necessities had a different origin), of those who had been partakers of the same truth with themselves, so we can not by any just law of scriptural interpretation limit Paul's declaration concerning the Christian's obligations to the creature of a direct service—the ox that treadeth out the corn.

Note the analogy obtaining between the poor saints at Jerusalem and the beneficiary as to the origin of their poverty. Those among the Jews who became Christians were poor in those things that minister to the flesh. From the beginning, as you all know, the preaching of Christ found but little acceptance except among the poor. The poverty of the first believers was increased day by day by the violent hatred of the Jewish authorities and the upper classes. Christ called all classes into his service. The poor in this world's goods obeyed. Their obedience involved them in still greater poverty. The devoted but poor student is called of God into a service. To refuse the call, leaves him a competence. To obey, involves him in a helpless poverty. He yields and incurs poverty rather than disobey God. His poverty is not self-imposed but the result of service and obedience to the Master's call. His obedience and the needs of the kingdom of grace fix your obligation.

And when you have entered upon the discharge of your obligation to the beneficiary, you have done no more than the far-

mer is doing for his beast of burden or the government for its enlisted soldiers. Did not the logic and practical wisdom of both the farmer and the government exceed that of "the children of light," it would only be a question of time until the farmer would be impoverished, the industries and the government paralyzed. The farmer feeds and trains his colt for two or three years without any return service in order that he may get a better service in the future. When the government needs men they are enlisted and sent to camp for drill until they have acquired the power of usefulness. From the hour of enlistment these raw recruits receive the recompense of regulars. The farmer pursues his course because it is wisdom and the government, because it is just and right.

From what has been said it would seem evident that the Christian's or Church's obligation to the candidate for the office of the ministry of the word is both scriptural and common sense—provided a period of training is necessary. In regard to the necessity of training, if the mind of the Church no longer needs instruction on this subject, certainly the purse of the Church needs *enlightenment*. Hence it might be well to remind the Church that training or due preparation for the ministerial office is in keeping with the scheme of divine procedure respecting the propagation of revealed truth. There were none called of God to minister in holy things from the establishment of a regular worship that did not pass through a season of preparation for the work. The necessary expenses of this preparation were borne, sometimes, by those for whom their ministry was intended, and sometimes by others, which seems to show that in the divine mind training for the work and doing the work are equally important. In the case of Moses, the royal court of Egypt trained him for the priesthood, and the inhabitants of the Sinaitic peninsula supplied him with "the bread of carefulness," so that Israel might have a law-giver. The prophet Samuel, among the noblest of Old Testament characters, was received by the priests at three years of age, and, of course, maintained by the Jewish Church. So long as lineal descent in the priesthood was continued, they were maintained by the Church from birth to death. This was done because God so commanded, and

that he might have an efficient service. Even our blessed Saviour increased in wisdom and stature for thirty years, and then entered on his special work only after a season of special preparation. The apostles spent about three years under his instruction before they were given their commission. The apostle Paul, though probably the most learned man of the age, spent three years in Arabia Petraea preparatory to his great work among the Gentiles. This was doubtless necessary that he might come into harmony and sympathy with scripture and the work assigned. It was not that he did not know scripture but because his view-point was now changed, which would compel a different construction and interpretation from that of his former training.

That men might not receive the holy office ignorant and unprepared, the early church fathers provided seminaries and, with the consent of their parents, took the children under their charge, protection and discipline. This custom was kept up through the middle ages by the monastic schools which were liberally endowed for the purpose by pious souls. We understand that to this day the priests of the Roman Catholic Church are all and altogether educated at the Church's expense. All Protestant denominations, also, have been pursuing the same course with varying degrees of liberality, some granting three and four hundred dollars annually to each needy student, whilst the Lutheran Church reaches the maximum at two hundred dollars. Thus, when an appeal is made by the Church in behalf of Beneficiary Education, she is only following the markings made by the divine hand on the pages of sacred history.

If in compliance with his command, the Church prays the Lord of the harvest for laborers, will he not send them? Of course he will. But the Church must prove the sincerity of her prayers by her willingness to help the Lord in his work. The simple fact of a command being given implies co-operation on the part of the commanded, otherwise it would not have been given. As the Great Head of the Church did not define nor limit the sphere of her co-operation, the limit of co-operation is her means and her consecration. The Lord will send the la-

borers but the Church must equip them, when necessary, for the work. It is only when the Church is really unable to equip them that he will provide for their needs unaided by her. There is nothing in the Bible to show that God works miracles to accommodate a lazy or stingy people or Church. Our duty is to pray and then do what we can to compass the object of our prayers. Wherein our efforts fail God will graciously supplement them, but not until we have done what we could. Our blessed Lord spent a whole night in prayer before he appointed the apostles. But if he did so, he also appointed them the next day. To pray the Lord of the harvest for ministers and do nothing toward providing them is fanaticism. But to pray God for the necessary supply and do what you can toward securing a supply is to walk in the very footsteps of Christ. While it is true that God must furnish the smooth stones, it is also true that David must furnish the bag and sling.

Now if what has been said be good theology, then it ought to stand the test of experience. As theory is one thing and practice, often, quite another, so true theology is one thing and man's understanding of it quite another. God is never wrong but man sometimes misunderstands his precepts and commands. Let it be asked, therefore, if it is quite the thing to give charity to able bodied young men? Does it not destroy their manhood and make them mere dependents? As to the question of charity, it cannot by any parity of reasoning be shown that it is an act of charity to aid the indigent student in preparation for the Gospel ministry. That it is not charity to aid the poor Gospel student may be most clearly seen by reference to a young man who was of necessity a beneficiary, is now in the Lutheran ministry and with whose history the writer is more or less familiar. His history differs from all the rest only in the matter of dollars and cents, the demands of filial duty or the parents' willingness to educate a son for the ministry. The young man is about twenty one years of age. The exigencies of family affairs compelled him early in life to support himself and help the family also. By industry and care he has turned into the family treasury between three and four thousand dollars and is filling a position worth about eight hundred dollars per annum. With the past and

the present as a basis of calculation for the future it is only a question of several years until his income would be anywhere from twelve to fifteen hundred dollars per year. The Church, awake to its needs and opportunities and filled with a sanctified zeal for the reclamation of perishing souls, calls the young man from secular employments to minister in holy things. To this call he replies that, while it would be to his liking and close up a life-long breach between him and his ideal, he has neither an education nor money. The Church offers two hundred dollars per year with which, with great industry during vacations and the exercise of a strict economy, he can obtain an education and enter the ministry. The offer is accepted. Now which made the greater sacrifice for the good of the Church and the glory of God? The young man gave the Church eight hundred dollars annually for two hundred in return. At the end of a seven years course which he took, the Church, from a business point of view, would owe him forty two hundred dollars. Or the individual member of Central Pennsylvania Synod giving the full amount asked, 27 cents per member, for Beneficiary Education this Synodical year, will have contributed in fifteen thousand five hundred years as much as he did. West Pennsylvania Synod, the heaviest contributor in this line of church beneficence, gave last year only a little more than half as much for the same cause. Besides, the beneficiary referred to had the advantage of doing a real act of charity while the Church did a simple act of beneficence. He gave up six hundred dollars per year, not for eternal life which he had already in promise, but that he might labor more efficiently for others, while the Church gave him two hundred dollars a year that she might in return receive the fruits of his life-long labors. His was an act of charity. Hers was a business transaction. It is not charity at all but simple justice that the Church reward in some measure those who labor for her advantage and the good of souls.

But what of the manhood or independence of the beneficiary? The position of the Church is, if she follows the Bible precepts and examples, that the Lord of the harvest will not only call a sufficient number of men, but that he expects the Church to aid the poor candidates and educate the ignorant ones. If this po-

sition be correct, then supporting the needy does not deprive them of any of their liberty in God's service, If it be found that the contrary is true, then either the Church is wrong or man can lay claim to a wisdom superior to the Infinite One himself.

The opponents of Beneficiary Education have fallen into error and make the assertion as to the ill effects upon the benefited because of a perverted analogy between the beneficiaries of a devoted church and those of an individual or political party. They argue that the beneficiary of a man or party is an ingrate, if he does not recognize his obligations and merge in a measure his independence with the interests of his benefactor. And experience justifies the supposition that he will. Why should not the same thing have the same effect upon the beneficiaries of the Church? There is no reason why it should not and every reason in the domain of man and of God why it should have this effect. Then why argue the matter? Because the analogy is sufficient to show only the effect upon the life and character of the recipient of these favors. At this point all analogy ceases. In the one case the mind and heart are biased in favor of man or party whose object is not only local or temporal but may be hellish in design; in the other, the mind and heart are biased in favor of the Lord Jesus Christ and his Church whose interests can be only eternal and divine. To which one of the many thousands of members of any synod does the beneficiary owe most? He cannot tell you.

Did Grant, Sherman, Sheridan or Hancock lose their manhood because a nation kept and educated them *in toto*? They were indebted to the nation for their developed powers. In return they gave their best services unstintedly. To-day they are a nation's idols. So with the beneficiary. If true to the purposes of his creation, the prayers and consecrated gifts of thousands of souls, he has lost his independence in the line of the divine will, a higher and truer life and a larger usefulness. Such a man is biased in the very direction which God and the holy Christian Church want him to be biased. Let it be further said that he who does not cherish these obligations and proves recreant to his trust deserves the indignant wrath of an outraged God and the execrations of a righteous people.

Brethren, this beneficent work of yours has not only the divine sanction but is richly blessed of God. The evidence of this is found in the history of those indigent young men prepared by the Church for the Gospel ministry. From available statistics it appears that three-fifths of all the ministers of the Episcopal, Presbyterian, Congregational Churches as well as of our own beloved Zion are beneficiaries. Not to detain you with statistics let me state the simple facts. As compared with those who educated themselves or were educated by friends, the beneficiaries are in the majority as missionaries and pastors. As presidents of and professors in colleges, they stand on an equality. In secular employments you will find four self educated to one educated by the Church. In regard to those without a charge or occupation unknown, secretaries, editors and agents of benevolent societies the percentage is two to one in favor of the beneficiary.

From this showing it looks as though the Church would be the gainer if it adopted the method of supporting all and altogether. At all events as the Church serves God so he blesses her. We declare but the truth when we say that there is no single line of church beneficence that is so full of rich blessings to you and your neighbor for the outlay as Beneficiary Education.

Not only is the return blessing great, but so pressing is the demand for ministers that this work must be continued with increased benefactions or a halt called on the advance guard of Home and Foreign Missions. Not is this all. The day is fast approaching when some of the old and well established pastorates must lie fallow for want of preachers to supply them. The number graduated annually from the schools of the prophets but little more than make up for the loss by death and sepearanuation.

The question left with you, brethren, for your solution then is this: Do you care more for the few dimes that you do not need than you care for the temporal and spiritual blessings of Christianity. This is just the position of every child of God who is indifferent on the subject of church beneficence. He does not

believe in it because he cares more for himself than he does for the cause of Christ. He does not believe in it because the dollar in his pocket-book is deemed by him greater in value than all that the religion of Jesus Christ has done for him, his family or the nation which by God's blessing has become the most wonderful in the world in affording privileges, opportunities and material blessings to its citizens. He does not believe in it, because he holds the dollar so close to his eyes that it looks bigger than all of God and eternity. Drop it from before your eyes and catch a glimpse of the Almighty in love and sacrifice.

Let us as pastors and people, with eyes and ears attuned to heavenly voices and scenes, turn toward the eternal throne a moment. What do we hear? Hark! the voice of Jesus—"Go preach the Gospel to every creature." An echo is heard, the voice of an apostle—it is Paul's. What saith it? "How shall they hear without a preacher?" Expectation reigns. The heavens are silent. List! "Here am I, send me," is the cheerful response from the lips of earth's gifted, pardoned, consecrated young men. With beaming countenance the Saviour says to winged messengers, "Go, tell my beloved disciples." The gifts, the expression of the love, zeal and self-sacrifice of thousands of consecrated souls are gathered by them on jeweled platter. Across it and in letters of gold is written the amount. It is given to Jesus. He raises his eyes, looks out upon the multitude of perishing souls. Moved with compassion, he weeps.

ARTICLE VIII.

THE LITURGICAL QUESTION.

By PROFESSOR J. W. RICHARD, D. D., Gettysburg, Pa.

Time and again have we been requested during the last few months to present to the Bhurch a paper on the LITURGICAL QUESTION, and to make the discussion bear principally on the COMMON SERVICE. We yield to the requests not reluctantly, believing with judicious men that such a paper as we propose, calm, tranquil, and based on facts, will promote the glory of God and the good of the Church. It is not our object to enter into controversy, or to attack men's persons, or to impugn the motives of men, whether of the living or of the departed. Hence we have based this paper on facts—facts which sooner or later must and will become known, for in matters of history where the original documents are still in existence, it is just as impossible to conceal facts *forever*, as it is to render them non-existent. The facts which concern us now are those of the history of the Lutheran Liturgical Worship and the facts about the COMMON SERVICE as related to that history.

I. WE BEGIN WITH LUTHER.

No sooner did Luther begin to reform the doctrines of the Church, than he began to reform the worship of the same, for with him doctrine had no value except as it could be made available for the comfort and edification of poor sinful souls. He saw how the word of God was obscured by the traditions of men, and how Christ was dishonored by the sacrifice of the Mass. It was with a view to the restoration of the word of God to its true place, that in the year 1523 he wrote his little tract entitled: "OF THE ORDER OF THE DIVINE SERVICE IN THE CONGREGATION."* He says: "Divine Worship, which now prevails everywhere, has a noble Christian origin, as has also the office

*Erlangen Ed. of Works, 22, p. 154 et sq.

of the ministry. But as the office of the ministry has been corrupted by ecclesiastical tyrants, so also has Divine Worship been corrupted by hypocrites. As we do not abolish the office of the ministry, but seek to restore it to its true position, so it is not our intention to abolish Divine Service, but to bring it to its proper position.

"Three great abuses have overtaken the Divine Service. First: The word of God has been silenced, and we have only reading and singing in the Church. This is the most wanton abuse. Secondly: Where the word of God has been silenced, there so many unchristian fables and lies have entered in legends, songs and sermons, that it is dreadful to contemplate them. Thirdly: The Divine Service is performed as a work by which to obtain the favor of God and salvation. Hence faith goes by default, and every one wants to found churches and monasteries, or to become a priest, a monk, a nun.

"Now, in order to put away these abuses, it must be distinctly understood that the Christian congregation is never to come together except to preach the word of God and to offer prayer, even though it may be ever so short, as in Ps. 102 : 23: 'When kings and the people assemble to serve God, they shall declare the name and praise of God.' And Paul in 1. Cor. 14 : 31, says; that in the congregation there shall be prophesying and teaching and admonishing. Therefore if the word of God be not preached, it were better neither to sing nor to read nor to assemble." He urges the Christians to assemble early in the morning, as in the time of the apostles, for the purpose of reading the Scriptures. "Then shall the priest or the person appointed, come forward and explain a portion of the lesson so that others may understand it, learn and be admonished. This work Paul calls speaking with tongues; the other, explaining and prophesying and speaking with the understanding, 1 Cor. 14 : 26. And unless this be done, the congregation will not be benefited by the reading, just as has been the case heretofore in cloisters and monasteries, where they have simply blown against the walls. * * After the reading and explanation have lasted half an hour or so, the congregation shall thank and praise God and pray for the fruit of the word. To this end let them use Psalms, and some good re-

sponsorships and antiphons, but brief, so that all may be done in one hour, or so long as the people wish, for souls must not be burdened so as to become tired and disgusted, as hitherto in cloisters and monasteries they have had a donkey's burden laid upon them.

"On Sunday the whole congregation shall assemble to sing the Mass and the Vespers, but at both services there shall be preaching to the congregation; in the morning the usual Gospel, in the evening the Epistle, or as the preacher may think best. If any one should desire the sacrament, it may be given him, as all can be done together according to circumstances of time and persons.

"But the daily Mass shall not take place, for reliance must be placed upon the word and not upon the Mass. Yet if any one should desire the Sacrament on a week day, let a Mass be held, according as worship and time permit, for there must be no law nor restraint.

"The hymns in the Sunday Mass and Vespers may remain, for they are good, and are derived from the Scriptures; yet they may be abridged or lengthened. It shall be the duty of the pastor or preacher to appoint hymns or Psalms for the morning, so that a Psalm, a good responsory or an antiphon with a collect way be arranged. In the evening also after the lesson and explanation, there may be reading and singing. But the antiphons, the responsories, the collects, the legends of the saints or of the cross, must not be used yet awhile, until they are cleansed, for they contain a shocking amount of filth." He recommends the abolition of the festivals of all the saints; but would retain the festivals of Purification, of Annunciation, of the Assumption, of the Nativity, of John the Baptist, but declares the legends of the apostles impure. "In a word: This is all done that the word may come into use, and not become again a howl and a sound. It were better that everything go by default, than the word, and nothing has been employed superior to the word. * * One thing is needful, namely, that Mary sit at the feet of Christ and hear the word daily, which is the better part that Mary has chosen and which shall never be taken

from her. The word is everlasting. All else must perish, however much Martha may have to do. God help us. Amen."

In the above extracts we have presented about two thirds of Luther's famous tract on Divine Service. The parts omitted would in no sense modify the view here offered. It will be observed that he lays decided emphasis on the *preaching* and *teaching* of the word of God, and that he enjoins *preaching* even in connection with the celebration of the Lord's Supper, which was still called the Mass. But what is yet more remarkable, is his almost *complete abolition* of the festivals of the Church. Only a few are to be retained. The Psalmody of the Church must be retained, and prayer and praise must accompany the reading and the explanation of the word, but the one chief thing is that *Mary must ever sit at the feet of Jesus*. Times and circumstances must be allowed to modify the service, and there must be no law, nor arbitrary limitation; and yet everything tends to brevity and simplicity.

In all this we who are the followers of Luther as he was the follower of Christ, see a principle which we can neither ignore nor surrender. The *preaching* of the word must be made the *chief* thing, and pastors must qualify themselves, above everything else, to preach the word effectively and profitably. The people must be taught the Divine will, and the way of salvation. Before all other things the pastor is a *preacher*. All his graces, activities, studies, accomplishments, must bend in the direction of the pulpit. And a Christian congregation can render no higher, nor more acceptable service and worship to Almighty God, than reverently and prayerfully to hear the reading and exposition of the Divine word. The service at the altar, whether in confession and absolution, in responsory and antiphon, in Psalm and in creed, can have no higher office than to prepare the mind and heart of the worshiper for the reception of the word of truth. In so far as fixed forms of Divine Service can be made to subserve this end, they may and *ought* to be used, for thereby good order is maintained and a spirit of reverence is begotten; but when they are allowed the *chief* place in the Divine Service, then the Gospel is silenced, and we have that "most

wanton abuse" of which Luther speaks in the quotation given above.

Later in the same year (1523) Luther wrote his *Formula Missae*, or form for the celebration of the Lord's Supper. It has in view this *one sole end*. In the opening paragraph he says: "We shall treat of a godly formula for saying the Mass, as they call it, or for celebrating the communion; but we will do it in such a way as not any longer to rule hearts by word or doctrine, but will try to provide for the public service so as to prejudice no one, nor to disallow any one to follow another. Moreover, we heartily beseech for Christ's sake that of anything better shall have been revealed to them, they bid us be silent, that we may serve the common cause by a common service.

"First of all therefore we declare that it is not, nor ever has been our mind to abolish entirely all worship of God, but to purify that which is in use, but which has become vitiated by the most reprehensible additions, and to point out its pious use. For it cannot be denied that Masses and the Communion of bread and wine, are a rite divinely instituted by Christ, which at first under Christ himself and then under the apostles, was observed in the most simple and pious manner, and without any additions. But in the course of time it was augmented by so many human inventions, that besides the name, nothing of the Mass and Communion has come down to our times."

After expressing his approbation of the pure parts of the ancient service, and his disapprobation of the Canon and sacrifice of the Mass, he proceeds "to indicate the rite according to which the Communion shall be administered," which we condense as follows:

1. Introits—"although we would prefer the Psalms whence they have been taken, as formerly; but now we allow the accepted use. * * We at Wittenberg seek to keep Sabbath only on the Lord's day, and on the festivals of the Lord only. We think that the festivals of all the saints should be utterly abolished, or if there be anything worthy in them, that it be joined with the Lord's-day services."

2. The Kyrie Eleison. Nine times.

3. The Gloria in Excelsis—"yet it will depend upon the judgment of the bishop, how often it may be omitted."

4. Prayer or Collect—"but only one."

5. The Epistle. "The person who arranged the epistles seems to have been remarkably unlearned, and a superstitious promoter of works. Duty required that those in the main should be selected which teach faith in Christ. The same certainly was had in view too frequently in the Gospels, whoever was the author of those lessons."

6. Graduale with Hallelujah. "The Hallelujah is a perpetual voice of the Church, as it is a perpetual memory of its passion and victory."

7. The Gospel—"where we prohibit neither candles nor incense, neither do we require them. Let that be free."

8. The singing of the Nicene Creed.

9. The Preface, preceded by the *Sursum corda*, and the *Gratias agamas*.

10. Words of Institution.

11. Sanctus and Benedicamus. "The bread and cup are elevated, according to the usual rite, especially on account of weak persons who may be offended because of a sudden change in this important ceremony of the Mass."

12. The Lord's Prayer, ending with the *Pax Domini*, which is a sort of public absolution from sin, a voice of the Gospel proclaiming forgiveness of sins."

13. Administration, with singing of the Agnus Dei.

14. Benedicamus Domino.

15. Benediction. Numbers, 6 : 24-26.

Luther then writes: "Such are our views of the Mass, in all which things care must be taken not to make a law out of liberty, or to compel those to sin who would do otherwise, or who would omit certain things. Only let the words of institution be preserved intact, and then let them act in faith. For such ought to be the rites of Christians, that is, the children of the free woman who voluntarily and *ex animo* observe them, prepared to change them as often and in what manner they please. Wherefore it is not necessary that any one either seek or institute any necessary form or law in this thing, whereby they may

ensnare or vex consciences. Wherefore among the early fathers and in the primitive Church we read of no example of this rite full, except in the Roman Church. Nor should it even be followed if they had set up something as a law on this matter, because these things neither can be, nor ought to be bound. Moreover, if different persons should use different rites, let no one either judge or condemn another, but let each one be satisfied in his own mind, and let us mind the same thing, even though we do things differently." Further: Luther inveighs against the private Mass as contrary to the institution of Christ. He insists on an examination of those who seek the Lord's Supper, in order that it may appear whether or not they are impelled by proper motives. In the matter of private confession before communion, he teaches that it is not necessary nor to be required, but that it is useful and not to be despised.

These are the broad, liberal and flexible principles by which Luther was guided in the construction of his first liturgical order, and in the purification of the services of the Church. These principles are simple, evangelical, and easy of application. Luther will not ordain, he will not decree, he will not bind consciences. He is anxious simply that the word of God be preached, and that the institution of Christ be kept free from idolatry. Alt says: "This *Formula Missae* clearly indicates how far the Papal order of Mass may be used *for a time* in an evangelical Divine Service. This was demonstrated by the German Mass published three years later (1526), which is less dependent upon the Papal Ritual, is distinguished by greater simplicity, and brings forward the proper character of a Divine Service ordered according to evangelical Lutheran principles; although as Luther himself observes, even this, as likewise the earlier form of Divine Service, was instituted for simple-minded lay people, to train up the young, to call and incite people to faith, until Christians who regard the word with sincerity, find themselves at home in it, and hold fast to it. Should this come to pass, he hoped then for the introduction of a third service, which he did not present, but sufficiently explained by indications, and which Count Zinzendorf confessedly followed as a guide, in setting forth a service for the Moravians. But in the liturgies of the Churches

of Lutheran countries, one or the other of Luther's two orders was taken as the basis—the *Formula Missae*, where there was the greater attachment (*Anhänglichkeit*) to the Papal Ritual; the German Mass, where there was the greater independence. This latter order of Divine Service is set forth by Luther as follows:”*

1. Spiritual Hymn or Psalm.
2. Kyrie Eleison—“Three times, and not nine times, as follows: Kyrie Eleison, Christe Eleison, Kyrie Eleison.”
3. Collect.
4. Epistle.
5. German Hymn.
6. Gospel.
7. Creed Hymn: “Wir glauben All’ an Einen Gott,” to be sung by the congregation. (This is Luther’s versification of the Creed).
8. Sermon on the Gospel for the Sunday or Festival.
9. Paraphrase of the Lord’s Prayer, and Admonition to the communicants, “which may be made either from the pulpit immediately after the sermon or before the altar. The ancients made it from the pulpit.”
10. Consecration—Words of institution.
11. Distribution, with singing *Agnus Dei* and *Sanctus*.
12. Thanksgiving Collect.
13. Benediction.

This, be it understood, is the famous *Deutsche Messe*,† or German Mass of 1526. It is simpler and more evangelical than the *Formula Missae*. It opens the service with a hymn or Psalm instead of the regular introit for the day; it reduces the the Kyrie from nine to three times; it omits the *Gloria in Excelsis*; it substitutes the Creed Hymn for the Nicene Creed; it obliterates the Preface with the preceding Salutation and *Sursum Corda*, with which the Preface opens; it directs the

**Christliche Cultus*, p. 243.

†*Works*, 22, p. 227 et seq. The German Mass was used first at Wittenberg October, 29, 1525. Seckendorf, II., 6, VIII, XX. It is not improbable that it was printed and published that year yet, but dated, as is not unfrequently the case in Germany, the year following.

minister to consecrate the elements immediately after the Exhortation. The German Mass is a fuller realization of the principles laid down in the ORDER OF DIVINE SERVICE IN THE CONGREGATION, and a clearer recognition of the great law of adaptation. Worship is for the edification of the people. Therefore it must be in the language of the people, and must be conducted with such forms as can be most easily apprehended by the people.

But Luther did not abolish the *Formula Missae*. To have done this would have been to proceed in a radical and revolutionary manner. For hundreds of years the people had used only the Latin language in the Mass. Many of them understood it and could use it profitably. To have taken this away entirely and to have thrust upon them a language which as yet was new in the Christian world, would have been to scandalize many, would have been a reckless violation of the very principles of freedom which both forms assert. Besides, there were schools attached to many important churches, in which the youths were taught the Latin so skillfully and so thoroughly that they learned to speak it fluently. Luther says: "I do not desire the order contained in the *Formula Missae* changed or removed, but as it has hitherto been retained among us, so I would have its use left free, where and when we please, as occasion arises, for I would by no means have the Latin language entirely excluded from Divine Service. For I desire to do everything for the young, who ought to be trained up in several languages. If I had the power, and the Greek and Hebrew languages were as common among us as the Latin, and had as much excellent music, I would have Mass celebrated, sung and read one Sunday after another in all four languages, German, Latin, Greek and Hebrew."* (Vol. 22, p. 229).

*Daniel says (*Codex Liturgicus*, II. p. 99). "The Church of Luther embraced his views. Down to the beginning of the present century in many churches the Gloria, Creed, the Prefaces, the Benedicamus Domino were sung in Latin." In the Wittenberg Order of 1533 the Epistle, the Gospel, and the Collects were sometimes read in Latin, "because we have a university here, and the learned men stand nearest the altar and understand the Latin."

In the German Mass Luther asserts still more positively the great law of Christian liberty. He says: "Before all things I kindly intreat all those who may see this our order of Divine Service, not to make a necessary law out of it, nor to bind or hamper anybody's conscience with it, but in Christian freedom to use it according to their pleasure in what manner, where, when, and so long as their affairs may justify or require. We by no means intend to lord it over any one, or to rule with laws. * * I by no means require that those who have their own good orders, or by the grace of God can improve them, should lay them aside and follow us. For it is not my intention that all Germany should accept this our Wittenberg order." (Vol. 22. pp. 227-8). Uniformity within a county or in the large cities, he regards as desirable, but as by no means necessary.

In the German Mass Luther also gives greater prominence to preaching—declaring that in "*the Divine Service the greatest and most important part is the preaching and teaching of the word.*" (Vol. 22, p. 235). He also sets forth the outline of a still simpler service, which he calls the proper form of the evangelical order, and which is intended for those who are Christians indeed, and who with hand and mouth confess the Gospel. He says: "The third, that is, the true form of the evangelical order does not take place so publicly, and among all kinds of people, but with those who wish to be Christians indeed, and who confess the Gospel with hand and mouth. These must record their names and assemble in a house alone for Prayer, Reading, Baptizing, receiving the Sacrament, and doing other Christian duties. In this order those can be known who do not conduct themselves as Christians, can be admonished, corrected, excommunicated, put under the ban, according to Matt. 18 : 15, seq. * * But I cannot and may not yet order or set up such a congregation or assembly. For I do not have the people nor the persons for it, and I see but few persons who are inclined towards such a thing. But should it come to pass that I must do it, so that I cannot omit it with a good conscience, I will give it my attention, and do the best I can. Meanwhile I will abide by the two services already mentioned, and will promote that Divine Service among the people, together with preaching, in order to in-

struct the young and to call and incite others to faith, until Christians who really have a regard for the word, find themselves at home in it, and hold it fast, so that no schism arise—which I could draw out of my own brain. For we Germans are a wild, raw, boisterous people, with whom it is not an easy matter to undertake anything, unless the highest necessity compels." (Vol. 22, pp. 230. et seq).

The above sketch affords a clear, distinct and comprehensive view of Luther's Liturgical Principles. We note and emphasize the following points:

1. Luther's moderate conservatism. He was not willing to break away entirely from the past. There was much in the old forms of worship which could be rendered edifying. This he would still preserve.

2. His tendency to greater simplicity. The *Formula Missae* is much simpler and briefer than the Roman Ritual, from which it was taken in the main. The German Mass was still briefer and simpler than the *Formula Missae*. He evidently looked forward to the time when much still in use could be safely and profitably removed. But in order to train up the young, to attract other people, to avoid schism, he was willing to hold on to the *Formula Missae* and the German Mass. (Vol. 22, p. 231).

3. His recognition of and obedience to the law of adaptation. He recognizes a new ecclesiastical environment. Worship must be adapted to the genius of a people, and to the present condition of things. History proves that this is the only correct principle of liturgical construction.

4. The entire subordination of liturgical service to the teaching and preaching of the Divine word. "Mary must sit at the feet of Christ, and hear the word daily." "The greatest and most important part (*grössest und fürnehmst stück*) is the preaching and teaching of God's word." (Vol. 22, pp. 153-235.)

5. The emphatic proclamation of Christian liberty in the use of liturgical service. This principle he carries so far as to declare that each one may order his own service. Beck in his Pastoral Theology (p. 69) says: "How earnestly this zeal for the externals of the Church was combated by Luther is evident from

several of his sermons (Church-Postils); for example: 'To make a necessity of it as though there were no alternative, and to make it binding on the conscience as though it were heretical to do otherwise—this is a thing we will not tolerate at the risk of life and limb. Indeed even of the sacrament he says: 'To keep it as of necessity and in obedience to the outward commandment is to quench faith and gospel—yea, it is damnable.'” Luther also declares that he retains the Epistles and Gospels as they are ordered in the postils “because there are so few intelligent (Geistreich) preachers, who can effectively and profitably handle an entire Evangelist or other book,” (Vol. 22, p. 239.)—by which he means to say that if the preachers were better educated and generally more intelligent, they could be intrusted with the duty of making their own selections of Scripture both for reading and for texts.

II. THE DEVELOPMENT OF LUTHER'S PRINCIPLES OF THE COMMUNION SERVICE.

As seen already in the passages quoted from Alt (p. 110) Luther's principles of the communion had a too-fold development. Those churches which had a greater attachment (Anhänglichkeit) to the Roman Ritual, made the *Formula Missae* the basis of their orders of worship. Those which were more independent (Selbst-Ständiger) adopted the German Mass as the basis of their orders. In his *KIRCHENJAHR* (1860) p. 439, Alt has stated the method of development more fully and accurately thus: IN REGARD TO THE GERMAN-EVANGELICAL CHURCH-YEAR, as it took shape under manifold influences in the different countries, we find in reference to doctrine a thorough-going complete harmony as over against the Papacy. All the Church Orders are at one in the rejection of the Mass, the adoration of the saints and other abuses of the Papacy, and recognize as a true Christian Divine Service only that in which the word of God is purely (rein und lauter) preached, and the sacraments are rightly administered. They are less uniform in those parts about which the Reformers were satisfied (zufrieden) (provided only the chief end (Hauptzweck) was attained, viz., that the word of God have free course) to determine nothing absolutely, but wished to leave

to every one a free hand, to retain or abolish, of that which had hitherto been in vogue, whatever any one for the sake of his conscience or on account of the weak, regarded as salutary.

"On the ground of this liberty universally recognized within the domain (Bereich) of the Evangelical Confession, so to order the public Divine Service and the times thereof, as should best correspond to the needs of the congregation, there arose in connection with the Evangelical Lutheran Church year, as it took shape first in the Electorate of Saxony, an Evangelical Church-year which on the one side approached the Roman Catholic, on the other, the Reformed Cultus; in that on the one side certain festivals and usages of the Roman Catholic Church were held as in perfect harmony with the Evangelical Confession, while on the other side, holding on to that which in Catholic Cultus was scriptural, they sought to unite the views of the Reformed with the practice of the Lutherans."

In this judgment of Alt, a most competent, learned and scientific authority, there are several points to be noted. (a) These two different types of the Church-year as they embodied themselves in the Church Orders, are *entirely at one* in doctrine. (b) The one type representing, as we shall hereafter see, the practice of Northern and Central Germany, is *Romanizing* in its usages; the other, representing South-west Germany, inclines towards the simplicity of the Reformed, without relinquishing in any sense the Evangelical, that is, the Lutheran Confession, for Alt declares that they are all alike within the domain of the Evangelical, that is, the Lutheran Confession. (c) By "views of the Reformed," Alt of course can have no reference to *doctrine*, for that would flatly contradict what he had just declared in regard to doctrine. He refers to the views of the Reformed in regard to festivals and certain usages in contrast with the Romanizing usages of the other class. (d) That the Reformers were indifferent in regard to these *adiaphora*, provided only the Gospel be purely preached and the Sacraments be rightly administered. (See Augsburg Confession Art. XV.) Alt proceeds to illustrate the foregoing distinctions as follows:

"A. THE LUTHERAN EVANGELICAL CHURCH-YEAR.

"In harmony with the above named determinations (Rathschlagen) and regulations (Anordnungen), the Wittenberg Church Order* (Kirchen-Ordnung) was the first to appoint a three-fold Divine Service for the Festival of Sunday.

"(a) The early Divine Service was appointed for the Catechism-Sermon. 'On Sunday early,' it says, 'shall the priest or deacon preach from the Catechism, and when it is finished, he shall begin again. Thus the preacher has time enough to go over the whole Catechism well and diligently, especially that which is required for the domestics. At special festivals the priest may preach at these hours something about the festivals, the Sacrament, the confession. After the sermon the words of the Catechism and the command of Christ in regard to both sacraments may be repeated, with exhortation to prayer. The lecture on the Catechism and the festivals, the lecture on the Gospel, or O. T. prophets for the day, and a German hymn, shall precede the early sermon. After the sermon another German hymn shall be sung. Then the Te Deum or the Athanasian Creed, closing with the collect and the Benedicamus Domino.

"(b) The Communion (Haupt-Gottesdienst), or Mass shall begin with the Benedictus, (Luke 1 : 68), and the Introit or a suitable German Psalm. Then the Kyrie and the Gloria, the Collect and the Epistle. Then may follow a German hymn from the Scripture. Then shall follow the Gospel, the Creed and the Sermon on the Gospel. Then the De Pacem is sung, Latin or German, whereupon the Priest reads a collect at the altar, and while the congregation sings a German hymn, the bread and wine are made ready for the Communion which is to follow.

"(c) The evening Divine Service shall be used for a sermon

*This is the First Wittenberg Church-Order (1533). It is very important, because it exhibits the liturgical practice of the Reformers. It "superseeded the personal orders of Luther and Bugenhagen, and thereafter was used by them." (See Preface to Common Service of the United Synod). It is characterized by brevity, simplicity and flexibility. It is not a little significant that Alt has chosen it as the normal type of the Lutheran liturgy, and distinguishes it by the title "Lutheran evangelical." The writer is so fortunate as to possess a copy of this rare work.

on the Epistle, or whatever from the Holy Scripture shall seem good, and shall be held in the way indicated above.—But in the country churches the Catechism sermon shall be preached at this time." This Order also arranges simple services for each day in the week. But in each case it says: "The Priest shall preach from Holy Scripture," "from the Gospel." It provides also for the following festivals: Christmas—"three days;" New Year; Epiphany; Purification; Annunciation; Passion Week; Easter; Ascension; Whit-Sunday; St. John's day; Visitation of Mary; Michaelmas.

Alt closes his discussions of this section with the following observation: "This Church-year, regarded by the Lutherans as *their own*, obtained recognition (Geltung) with the Lutherans beyond the borders of Germany, in Denmark, Norway, the East Sea provinces, and wherever the Lutheran Church established congregations, as the especial 'evangelical Church-year;' and now again by many, amid painful complaints about the multitudes which have come in the course of time, is pointed to as the ideal and goal to which we must again attain." p. 442.

Alt next proceeds (p. 444) to

"B. THE CATHOLICIZING EVANGELICAL CHURCH-YEAR.

In harmony with the Minden Church Order (1530), the Brandenburg-Nurnburg (1533), the Nassau Instruction (1536), the Nordlingen (1538) and the Brandenburg (1540), in which, with firm adherence to the evangelical confession, stands out very manifestly the effort to retain from the Roman Catholic forms of the Divine Service, whatever is in harmony with the doctrine of the Scripture. After a distinct rejection of the papal Mass-offering, it is urgently enjoined upon pastors and preachers in the cities to admonish diligently and retain the people to the Communion, so that there may be communicants *every day*, and that thus *daily* the Lord's Supper may be held. (That is every Sunday). "The order of Divine Service for Sunday morning is as follows: First shall the priest, if he holds Mass, in company with his attendants in their usual clerical attire, go to the altar and say the *Confiteor*. Then shall follow the Introit, the Kyrie, the Gloria; then a German hymn by the congregation. After

this the Gospel and the German Credo ('Wir glauben all an Einen Gott'). Then shall the pastor begin the sermon on the Gospel for the Sunday or Festival of the Church-Year.

After the sermon shall the Offertory,* or in villages a German Psalm, be sung. Then the Preface, the Sanctus and the Communion. If there be no communicants present, the preacher shall sing the German Litany, or the Lord's Prayer; or Mitten wir in Leben sind, or es wolle uns Gott gnädig sein," shall follow, closing with Verleih uns Frieden gnädiglich, a Collect and the Benediction."

In this order of the Evangelical Church-year, must also be classed in general the liturgies of Northern and Middle Germany, which manifestly, and as all liturgical scholars agree in stating, follow Luther's *Formula Missae*. Like the *Formula* (which is wholly Latin) they retain the Latin in many parts either wholly, or in alternative forms, and observe the same general order in the principal parts. Some of them go quite beyond it in the number of parts,—for instance the Mecklenberg, the Wittenberg (1559, 1565), especially the Austrian (1571), which both Kapp and Klöpffer say, "follows very closely the Romish Mass." In general it may be said of this order called by Alt "catholicizing," that it represents a reaction from the simplicity of Luther and the practice at Wittenberg and in the electorate of Saxony. This reaction culminated in the "*Luthero-Romanizing*," Mark Brandenburg (1540), which, in addition to an unusual amount of Latin, and a long list of Festivals and Saints' days, "restored almost literally the Gregorian Mass-text." (Alt). But with this extreme development Luther expressed dissatisfaction: "I do not think these additions will last long: especially the prolixity of the Mass and of the other offices—When they begin to be despised and to go down of their own accord, they will not long resist the contempt of the people."* Alt says that Luther's prophesy soon came true, for already in 1554, changes were made, and in 1572 a new Order was introduced.† Alt finally advances to

*Only the Brandenburg (1540) has the Offertory.

*De Wette's Luther's Briefe, V. 307.

†*Christliche Cultus*, p. 272.

"C. THE UNITING-EVANGELICAL CHURCH-YEAR,

"As the third form of the Evangelical Church-Year, stands out clearly in the South German Church Orders, which proceeded mainly from Brentz, viz., in the two Swabian for Swabian Hall (1526 and 1543), and the two of Württemberg (1536 and 1553)

* * "The Communion Service shall begin with the Introit de tempore; then the Kyrie, and if the time permits, the Gloria, the Collect, a Graduale or Alleluia. Then the text of the Gospel on which the sermon is preached. Then if time allow, the Nicene Creed follows. Then the Lord's Supper is celebrated as follows: The Admonition to the communicants. Consecration and distribution with the singing of the Sanctus." Some of this class allow the sermon to be preached either before or after the communion, as the pastor may think best. This class of South German liturgies is distinguished especially by simplicity, and flexibility. They plainly bear the characteristics of the German Mass on which they are based. But as the South German liturgies will pass under review again, we withhold further description at this place.

III.

We come now to consider the COMMON SERVICE, which was constructed by chosen representatives of the General Synod, the General Council, and the United Synod of the South. As the leading facts connected with the origin, the progress and the publication of this well-known manual of devotion, are generally known, it were superfluous to rehearse them here. We advance to the examination of the rule according to which it was constructed, viz., "The common consent of the pure Lutheran Liturgies of the sixteenth century, and when there is not an entire agreement among them, the consent of the largest number of those of the greatest weight." This we extract from the Preface to the edition of the COMMON SERVICE published "by authority of the United Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the South," and bearing date, Holy Week, 1888. It is in this form that the COMMON SERVICE represents the work of the joint committee who constructed it. It is in this form that the COMMON SERVICE as such must take its place in history. Hence it is in

this form that we pass it under review. We understand that the form to be published by the General Council will be identical with that now in our hand. But every fact and principle established or yet to be established in this paper applies and is intended to be applied, equally and in exactly the same sense, to that form of the COMMON SERVICE adopted by the General Synod, except in the case of the *Nunc Dimittis* and the *Benedicamus*, which it omits.

1. This rule, fairly interpreted and honestly applied, must result in the transference of the Liturgism of one language and of one ecclesiastical environment, into another language and another ecclesiastical environment, and without any regard being paid to the great and all-important law of adoption, which, however, *ruled supreme everywhere in the construction of this very Liturgism in the Fatherland three hundred years ago*. Furthermore, it may be said truly that such a rule, and such an application of such a rule, has appeared nowhere in the construction of any one of the great national liturgies—that all of the great historical liturgies of the Church have been constructed with special reference to the wants and conditions of those Christians who were expected to use them.

The first Roman liturgy of which we have any definite knowledge was compiled by Pope Leo (440–461), out of forms already in use, but which, as all learned liturgical scholars assure us, were adapted to the supposed needs of the Church of Rome at that time. This liturgy was revised and further adapted by Gelasius (492–496); and this again by Gregory the Great (590–604); which remains to all intents and purposes the Roman liturgy to this day, and which under the tyrannical policy of Rome has well-nigh supplanted all the national liturgies of Roman Catholic countries. But for a thousand years after Gregory, the different national churches which felt the influence of Rome's liturgy, *always* modified its forms and arrangements and offices to suit local and national conditions and circumstances. In the diocese of Milan in Northern Italy, the Ambrosian liturgy is still a living rite. It is Ephesine in its origin, and was gradually formed in the north of Italy, and at the first in entire independence of the Roman Ritual. The Gallican Liturgy also is a

national growth. Its germs came from Ephesus. It was enlarged, and improved and adapted by Hilary and others, but was violently suppressed by Charlemagne (742-814), who substituted for it the Roman Liturgy. This rite is the great historical value, as it is the basis of the ante-Reformation liturgies of Germany and England (but locally adapted), which in turn are the bases respectively of the Protestant liturgies of those countries. The Mozarabic Liturgy, which is still used in Toledo and in a few other places in Spain, was originally modeled after the Gallic rite, but was so much changed and improved by St. Isidore, that it has often been called by his name. It is a thoroughly national liturgy. In the year 596 "the great and good St. Augustine undertook his missionary work to the West Saxons." But he found that Christianity had preceded him to the Island of ancient England, and that the forms of worship were different from those of Rome. Under what was afterwards called Augustine's oak, he thus addressed the seven bishops of the English Church: "You act in many particulars contrary to our customs, or rather to the customs of the universal Church, and yet, if you will comply with me in these points, viz., to keep Easter at the due time; to perform the administration of Baptism by which we are born again to God, according to the custom of the Holy Roman and Apostolic Church, and jointly with us to preach the Word of God to the English nation, we will readily tolerate all your other customs, though contrary to our own."* Augustine, while passing through France on his way to England, observed that the modes and customs of that country also were different from those of Italy. In his perplexity he wrote as follows to Gregory: "Whereas the faith is one, why are the customs of the churches various? and why is one manner of celebrating the Holy Communion used in the Holy Roman Church, and another in that of the Gauls?" Says Blunt: "The answer of St. Gregory contained wise and catholic advice; and to it we owe under Providence, the continued use of an independent form of Divine Worship in the Church of England

*Blunt's *Annotated Book of Common Prayer.* p. 2.

from that day to the present. 'You my brother,' said Gregory, 'are acquainted with the customs of the Roman Church in which you were brought up. But it is my pleasure that if you have found anything either in the Roman or the Gallican or any other Church, which may be more acceptable to Almighty God, you carefully make choice of the same; and sedulously teach the Church of England, which is at present new in the faith, whatsoever you can gather from the several Churches. For things are not to be loved for the sake of places, but places for the sake of good things. Select, therefore, from each Church those things that are pious, religious and correct; and when you have made these up into one body, instill this into the minds of the English for their use,'* Here again the principle of adaptation rules. Gregory, though himself the author of the Roman Liturgy as at that time used, does not ask that that rite be transferred to England.

The Norman Conquest (1066) was followed by new ecclesiastical conditions in England. Two peoples with different languages and different customs were being commingled, and many of the dioceses were passing under the rule of Norman bishops. "One of these, Bishop Osmond of Sarum, A. D. 1085, revised the service book which he found in his diocese with such skill that it became the pattern for the greatest part of the country, and under the name of the 'Sarum Use' prevailed very generally for nearly five hundred years in the Churches of England."† Mark, Osmond did not introduce the Norman use. He revised the English use. Finally the Reformation came. Cranmer received instruction to revise the services of worship. October 7, 1544, he wrote to the King: "In which translation, for as much as many of the processions in the Latin were but barren, as meseemed, and little fruitful, I was constrained to use more than the liberty of a translator; for in some processions I have altered divers words; in some I have added part; in some taken part away: some I have left out whole either for because the matter appeared to me to be little to purpose, or because the days be not with us festal days;

*Blunt, *Annot. Bk. of Com. Pr.*, p. 2.

*Burbidge, *Liturgies of the Church*, p. 89.

and some processions I have added whole, because I thought I had better matter for the purpose than was the procession in Latin."* The same independence was observed in the construction of the Book of Common Prayer. Cranmer and his fellow-commissioners constructed an English Liturgy on English soil—by curtailing, expanding, translating, re-arranging, adding, adapting. It was a new book made out of previously existing materials, in the main. Hence Burbidge is historically unimpeachable when he says: "The English Service Books have always been distinctively *English*." "Our services are still distinctively English, even as they were in the time of the Reformation."† That is, he means, they have been formed on English soil, and with special reference to the wants of the English people. The American Book of Common Prayer is the English book of the same name altered to suit local conditions, and the alterations introduced do not stop with those required by differences in forms of government. "The Directory of Worship for the Reformed Church in the United States," does not even pretend to be the Consensus of the Reformed liturgies of a former century. It recognizes, as in a word do all the national liturgies, a new ecclesiastical environment. *And nowhere in the world was this principle of adaptation more clearly recognized, and more fully and widely acted on than among the Lutherans in Germany in the sixteenth century. It constituted the very foundation of Luther's two services, as well as that of the nearly or quite one hundred Lutheran liturgies which appeared in Germany during the sixteenth century,* so that it may be said that this principle of adaptation is of the very essence and vitality of the Lutheran liturgism; and as a matter of fact, Melancthon, Bugenhagen, Brentz, Osiander, Bucer *et. al.* composed *different* liturgies for different countries. Nor was the application of this principle confined to the sixteenth century. It was carried forward into the following century, which, though it was the great dogmatic period of the Lutheran Church, witnessed important liturgical changes; some in the direction of greater fullness; others in the direction of greater simplicity.

*From Blunt's Annot. Pr. Bk., p. 10.

†*Liturgies*, pp. 90, 262.

The most influential body of German Lutherans in America has recognized and acted on this principle of adaptation. The Liturgy of the Missourians is founded on the old Saxon Liturgies, but it is essentially a new work, and is characterized by brevity and simplicity. The "Lutheran Manual of Hymns, Liturgy, and prayers," published in Copenhagen, 1880, and used in America by Danish-English congregations, contains a very simple liturgical service, both for the regular Sunday morning worship, and for the communion. An eminent Danish Lutheran pastor and author in this country furnishes us with a full description of his service, which, he says, is exactly like that in Denmark. It is very brief and simple.

But the justness of this principle of adaptation is so apparent that it needs no elaborate defense. Whilst the Christian faith as a revelation from God, is one, and remains unchanged under all skies, the mode of administering the contents of that faith cannot be made uniform without extinguishing the freedom of the Christian man,—without making "rites instituted by men" marks and tests of the Church, and of unity among her members. But here is a Ritual in regard to which it is *officially* said that it was not constructed with reference to our times and wants.* It proposes to take the liturgy of the Lutheran Church of Germany, as it was three hundred years ago, and to transfer it *bodily* into America. It *ex professo* takes no account of changed times and different circumstances. It says, if not in words, yet in reality, that what was good enough for the fathers is good enough for the children, that there is no such a thing as growth, that the Holy Spirit has not taught anything new in worship within the last three hundred years, which it is our duty as well as our privilege to employ in our devotions. It says, practically, that the sixteenth century and the times prior thereto exhausted the *whole subject of worship*, and fixed *metes and bounds* thereto which we may not pass. This method of liturgical construction we pronounce *absolutely unhistorical*, as shown by the sketches given above of the great liturgies of the Church. Not the less is it *un-Lutheran*. Luther made the most significant charges in the liturgy of the Church, besides merely

*Minutes of the General Synod, 1885, p. 15.

throwing off its idolatry and superstitious observances; and almost every important town and state of Germany, modified, changed, adapted its liturgy, (some of them several times) during the sixteenth century. Moreover, we are not expected to act upon this method, or to be guided by this rigid adherence to the sixteenth century, in other matters ecclesiastical. What English-speaking Lutheran preacher of to-day models his sermons after those of Luther, Brentz, Bugenhagen, Osiander? What English-speaking Lutheran congregation sings or is expected to sing the "common consent" of the German Lutheran hymnology of the sixteenth century? What English-speaking Lutheran congregation of our time observes or is expected to observe, the Lutheran ecclesiastical customs of the sixteenth century, as, for instance, the consecration of just so many wafers as shall be used in communion, the signing with the cross, the Exorcism of the devil in baptism, private absolution, and others that might be mentioned? Why then should we be asked, or expected, to have and to use "in their order" *only* those forms of worship which are represented by "the common consent of the pure Lutheran Liturgies of the sixteenth century"? Such, however, is the rule according to which, it is claimed, the COMMON SERVICE was constructed, and it is well known, and well understood, that the most determined efforts have been made to have this service endorsed, recognized and used as the only true and proper Lutheran liturgy—a procedure which is *directly antagonistic*, not only to the very conception of Lutheran worship as expounded by the Reformers, but which flies in the face of the principle that regulated the construction of *every Lutheran liturgy of the sixteenth century*, viz., *the principle of adaptation*.

Moreover, the rule does not take into the account the question of the fitness or of the unfitness of the Christians of the sixteenth century to be the guides of the Christians of the nineteenth century in the matter of liturgies. This is a most delicate question. It touches a tender spot, and is likely to excite indignation against the man who raises it. But we turn that indignation from ourselves upon the man who both raised and answered it—the late learned Dr. C. Porterfield Krauth: "The most earnest Christians of that unhappy time required all the

grace they could command to keep from cutting each other's throats. It was no time for the production of a new, well-ordered service. It was a dogmatic, polemic and symbolic, not a liturgic period. For gentler and riper times, the great work of producing a true Liturgy has been reserved."*

Now, be it recalled, we have not yet written a word about the *application* of the Rule, nor about the *product* of the application of the Rule, viz., the COMMON SERVICE *as such*. We have discussed the rule simply as a principle in liturgical construction. We have shown it to be *unhistorical* and *un-Lutheran*. We believe it involves the principle of stagnation, and of ecclesiastical tyranny,—of stagnation, because it practically denies that the Holy Ghost has begotten a single new idea in the matter of worship during the last three hundred years; of ecclesiastical tyranny, because it practically denies to the Church of the nineteenth century the right to order her worship with reference to her present needs, and environment, and ever enlarging operations.

We come now to consider the application of the Rule.

2. The Rule includes only "the pure Lutheran Liturgies of the sixteenth century." This implies that there are impure liturgies of the sixteenth century bearing the Lutheran name, which were to be excluded from participating in furnishing the desired "common consent."

Now, the word, *pure* and *impure* have very definite meanings with us Lutherans in our theological controversies and discussions. We at once think of the *reine Lehre*, and of its opposite; and rightly so, for pure doctrine is that for which the Lutheran Church has contended *vi et armis* for more than three hundred years, and for which she has always been willing to bear shame and reproach and to suffer martyrdom, if need be. All honor to the Lutheran *reine Lehre*! and all honor to the men who have so valiantly defended it! If there be liturgies of the sixteenth century bearing the Lutheran name which have been unfaithful to the *reine Lehre*, then *let them be forever excluded* from participating in the formation of a service for the English-speaking Lutherans in America.

**Mercersburg Review* for 1869, p. 647.

Now we recall that Alt* divides the Lutheran liturgies of the sixteenth century into three classes, "the Lutheran Evangelical," which includes and represents the usage of Wittenberg and Electoral Saxony; the "Catholicizing-Evangelical," which includes and represents in general the liturgies of Northern and Central Germany, and the "Uniting-Evangelical," which includes and represents those of Southern Germany. Harnack† parts them into the *Majoritäts Praxis*, which includes those of Northern and Central Germany and Lower Saxony; and the *Minoritäts Praxis*, which includes those of Southern Germany.

It is commonly understood that the liturgies of Southwest Germany (sometimes spoken of by the liturgical writers as the liturgies of South Germany, of West Germany, all meaning the same thing) were allowed no part in determining the "common consent." On the thirteenth day of last June we ourself asked a prominent member of the Committee on the the Common Service, this question: "Why were the South German liturgies excluded in the matter of the common consent?" The instantaneous answer was: "Because they are tainted with Zwinglian and Calvinistic notions of the Lord's Supper." On the following day in our presence a learned professor in the General Synod's Theological Seminary, in an official capacity asked the same gentleman: "What does the word *"pure"* in this connection have reference to?" The answer came in one word: "Doctrine," and was accompanied with the statement, as additional reason for the rejection of the South German liturgies, that Bucer, whom Harnack names among the authors of the South

*Kirchen-jahr, p. 439 et seq.

†*Liturgical Tables*. Harnack cannot be strictly relied on in this discussion: (a.) He includes the Ulm liturgy (1531) in the *Minoritäts Praxis*. This liturgy is based upon that of Basle (Richter KOO) and was composed by Bucer *before* he became a Lutheran. It is not strictly Lutheran in doctrine. (b.) He names only Blaurer Schnepf, Bucer, u. A. as composers of the S. W. German liturgies. He does not mention *Brents*. He gives the following as South German liturgies: Baden, Nassau, Hohenlohe, Strassburg, Ulm, Worms, Würtemberg, u. A. Kliefoth names Baden, the Rhine, Würtemberg, Strassburg and other cities and small territories, p. 29. Alt simply mentions the two Swabian-Hall and the two Würtemberg as the chief representatives. *Kirchen-jahr*, p. 446.

German liturgies, "was a tainted man." On the day yet following, the same gentleman with Harnack's Table in hand, made *substantially* the same charges against the South German liturgies before the General Synod. A learned professor who was more than a spectator at Allegheny writes: "The entire handling of that point on the part of Dr.— indicated that their objection to the South German liturgies lay in their doctrine." These charges made in the presence of many witnesses, and *publicly*, produced a decided impression, and will not now, we presume, be denied, as not having been made. Other members of the joint-committee on COMMON SERVICE have reported to the writer hereof that representations about the South German liturgies made before the Committee created in their minds the impression that said liturgies were *impure in doctrine*. Such then seems to have been the reason for their exclusion—a reason to our mind, *entirely* satisfactory, if *based* on facts.

But as this is a very severe arraignment of the churches and liturgies of South Germany, and as it clearly implies that they would have been included in supplying "the common consent," but for this conception of their doctrinal character, it becomes an important matter to inquire into the facts.

1. *The Authorities.*

(a.) Klöpffer in his *Liturgik* (1840) pp. 155 et seq., mixes together the liturgies of North and South Germany and points out various items of individual difference, but does not indicate any difference of doctrine. To his mind they are all alike Lutheran liturgies, and are so treated.

(b.) Alt distinctly says that these *Uniting*, that is, South German liturgies, held fast to the evangelical confession, by which he means the Lutheran Confession. Neither in the *Christliche Cultus* nor in the *Kirchen-Jahr* does he ever mention any difference in doctrine between the three classes, but the very opposite—"Thorough-going complete harmony."

(c.) Dr. Krauth, in an article in the *Mercersburg Review* for 1869, incidentally mentions several of the churches and liturgies of South Germany, and *unqualifiedly* calls them *Lutheran*.

(d.) Ebrard, the great Reformed Dogmatician, says of Western Germany, especially of the Palatinate and Hesse: "As to

cultus, she was far from Puritanic, and was throughout Lutheran."*

(e.) Daniel says: "It is scarcely necessary to say that the churches of Württemberg, Baden, Mormpelgart and Strassburg, are called Luther-Calvinizing for no other reason (*nulla alia de causa*) except that in *rites and ceremonies* (Italics, Daniel's), they approach a little (*aliquantulum accedant*) to the unpolished and severe simplicity of the Calvinistic discipline. In Kliefoth they are called *Die Unrenden*—the Uniting—by which he means exactly what we do."† We turn now to

(f.) Kliefoth,‡ who on page 29, says that these Southern German liturgies "are fairly well characterized by calling them an abbreviation of the full Lutheran Service." On page 99, he says: "Between the diametrically opposed Lutheran and Reformed types, enter the Uniting Church-Orders, with various methods of adjustment. Nearest to the Reformed stands the KO§ of Palsgraf Frederick of the Rhine. According to this in a wholly Reformed manner, in the cities once a month, in the villages once in two months, after previous announcement, the Lord's Supper shall be held; but the preaching must be according to the Lutheran method, only not on the Perikope, and especially not so that the sermon came to stand independent (selbständig), but a sermon was preached on the Lord's Supper—whereby it returned to the standpoint of the Reformed. So also the Württemberg KO. of 1536, which has the yet more mod-

* *Dogmatic*, Quoted from *Mercersburg Review*, 1856, p. 260.

† *Codex Liturgicus*, II. p. 133. What these rites and ceremonies were, Daniel tells us at pp. 202, 215, 216, viz., Exorcism, Signing with the Cross, the Chrisom-Cloth in Baptism, etc. "Exorcism was never by the Lutherans referred to the essence of a sacrament, but it clung closely to our Church, because all her enemies, the Calvinists, the Enthusiasts, and the Separatists attacked this with their weapons."

‡ *Die Ursprüngliche Gottesdienst-Ordnung in den deutschen-Kirchen Lutherischen Bekenntnisses*. 1847.

§ This is the symbol for *Kirchen-ordnung*—Church-Order. An additional O pluralizes the word. These KOO., in folio or quarto volumes, contain sections on doctrine, Catechism, the Examination of candidates for the ministry, and all the rites and ceremonies of the Church.

erate addition that the Lord's Supper shall be held so often as there are communicants. On the contrary, the Strassburg KO. of 1598, holds fast the sermon after the Lutheran manner, that is, the sermon on the Pericope, and the Lord's Supper occurs in its proper places in the Lutheranly constructed Communion Service. But it returns towards the Reformed in that it alternates the celebration of the Lord's Supper among the several churches of the city, and has it celebrated each Sunday in only one church—whereby the Lutheran principle is naturally abrogated.* The Ott-Heinrich and the Baden-Highlands KO. of 1598, adopt the 'true mean.' Both order with the same words: 'The Communion of Christ may be celebrated every month, or every two weeks, or on Sunday and festivals in the Church, so often as there are communicants who have announced themselves beforehand,' at which also 'the Communion Sermon shall be preached together with a discourse on the usual text from the Gospel. Also a short instruction on the use and need of the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, shall be preached.' They also seek to blend the Lutheran Pericope Sermon (Perikopenpredigt) with the Communion Sermon (Abendmahls-predigt).†

Here now we have the true difference between the liturgies of Northern Germany, which Kliefoth calls *den ächten Typus* (the true type) and those of Southern Germany which he calls *Die Unrenden*. It is in *no sense* a difference of doctrine. He further explains: "She (the Lutheran Church) lays down as an ideal principle (*ideele Anforderung*) for the Divine Service, that it dare not be held without the Communion, as also for the congregation that there must be ever in it a hungering after the Sacrament, and thus that the table of the Lord dare not remain without guests. Hence in all the liturgies *vom ächten Typus*, she orders the chief Divine Service of Sunday (*sonntäglichen*

*Kliefoth means the Lutheran *ideele Anforderung* according to which the Lord's Supper must be administered in each Church every Sunday.

†This explains what is meant by Harnack when he says in his Table of these South German liturgies: "Unsicherheit über das Verhältniss von Wort und Abendmahl in Cultus." That is, some of them have a sermon on the Perikope; others, a Communion Sermon. Also some of them have the sermon before the communion, and some after.

Hauptgottesdienst) on the presupposition that there must be communicants, and that the Lord's Supper is to form an integral part," p. 89. Thus the liturgies which he calls *von dem ächten Typus* have direct reference to the communion, and have been constructed on the presupposition that the communion will be celebrated every Sunday. But as Kliefoth has said, they also foresee cases when there may be no communicants. Hence they have ordered a service under the title: "*When there are no communicants*," which in many cases contains important modifications of the service, not only of the part which follows the sermon, but also of that which precedes. From the very beginning they were not able to realize the *ideele Anforderung*. Daniel says in this immediate connection: "The Holy Supper was celebrated in very many churches only once a month; in others only quarterly." II. p. 115. On p. 124 he says: "Almost all have that sad clause: When there were no communicants present." And in this case it must not be forgotten that these Communion Services were constructed for congregations which sometimes contained thousands of members. It would not have been possible for any large proportion to commune every Sunday, nor were the same persons expected to commune every Sunday. Yet withal the Communion was not held every Sunday. Again: the liturgies of that class require that the sermon shall be preached on the Gospel of the day (*Perikopenpredigt*)—shall be independent (*Selb-ständig*), and without reference to communion, and that the communicants shall present themselves. In these three particulars the South German liturgies differ from the Northern German more or less, some in this particular and some in that. They provide that the communion may be held once a month, once a fortnight, or whenever *communicants are present*; that the sermon may be a communion sermon (*Abendmahlspredigt*), and some of them may invite the communicants according to the method of the Reformed. But if these are to be the tests of a pure liturgy, then the COMMON SERVICE itself is not a *pure* liturgy. For (a) what has it done to set up the ideal principle (*ideele Anforderung*) that the Holy Supper shall be celebrated every Sunday? Has it, as the liturgies "*von dem ächten Typus*" do, employed

a rubric requiring the preacher to exhort the people to remain for the communion, and to declare that if they do not do so, they give evidence of decline in piety? Nay, verily. It has been constructed on the principle that the preaching service is the chief thing, and shall recur every Sunday, and that the communion is to occur only at much longer intervals. On the very face of it, it makes that impression, for the *primary* title is: THE ORDER OF MORNING SERVICE. But the *title* of all that class of services from which the COMMON SERVICE professes to have been taken, is: THE ORDER OF THE MASS; OR THE COMMUNION; and on page 10, the COMMON SERVICE says: "If there be no communion," which shows that it has completely abandoned the *ideale Anforderung*, and there is no rubric to correct that impression.*

Moreover, our churches in America have adopted the Reformed practice of holding the communion, not every three or five weeks (Kliefoth p. 99), but much rather at intervals of from three to five *months*. And the COMMON SERVICE, by not interposing a check here, that is, by its very silence, has not only gone as Kliefoth would say, *in ganz reformirter Weise*, but very far beyond it. (b) Nor has it done anything to check the custom among us of preaching a Communion Sermon (Abendmahlspredigt) on communion day. And so generally is this the custom among us that it has actually come to be considered *un-Lutheran* not to preach such a sermon; and we are informed that a prominent member of the Committee opposed the Exhortation (Vermahnung) on the ground that he never uses it, but always preaches a *communion sermon* on communion day. The COMMON SERVICE has not ordered, as do the liturgies "vom ächten Typus," that the sermon every Sunday shall be a *Perikopenpredigt*. (c) Nor has it said simply, as do the liturgies "vom ächten Typus," that if there be those present who wish to commune, they shall assemble in *dem Chor*, die Mans-personen an einem und die Frauens-personen an einem andern Orte. Be-

*A Professor in the Concordia Theological Seminary, writes: "Communion is held in our larger congregations every other Sunday, in others every month, or four times a year, according to size of congregation." Is then the Liturgy of the Missourians impure?

sides, we have never yet seen a communion, whether in a church of the General Synod, or of the General Council, or of the United Synod, to which the communicants were not *invited*. There can be no denying the fact that in two of the above particulars, the entire English-speaking Lutheran Church of America, has gone quite over to the position of the Reformed, and in the first, it has, with the Reformed itself, gone quite beyond it; that is, in the words of Daniel, (see p. 128) the English-speaking Lutheran Church of America has become *Luthero-Calvinizing in RITES and CEREMONIES*. We ask again, Has the COMMON SERVICE brought back the *ideele Anforderung*? Nay, verily. Therefore judged by the practice of those who use it, and use it according to its fullest directions (and there is no more rational way of judging it), it is in these particulars one of the most "*Uniting*" liturgies that ever *bore the Lutheran name*; and hence again, judged by the rule of its own construction, it would for these reasons be placed *entirely* without the pale of the "pure" Lutheran liturgies. But if to this it be said that there is nothing in it which would hinder its use every Sunday as an actual communion service; then we reply that there was nothing in the South German liturgies which hindered their use in the same way. A rubric appears in nearly all of them directing that the communion shall be celebrated whenever there are communicants who present themselves.

We have now examined the chief authorities on the subject of the Lutheran liturgies. We find that they limit the differences between the liturgies of Northern Germany and those of South Germany (a.) to brevity and simplicity in favor of those of South Germany, (b.) to *rites and ceremonies*—rites and ceremonies which the English-speaking Lutheran Church in America has adopted, and constantly practices, and in adopting and practicing which, she does not regard herself as *un-Lutheran*. But this greater brevity and simplicity, and the relation of the sermon to the Lord's Supper are not Reformed in *origin*, nor is the latter characteristic confined to the *Unrenden*. Luther's German Mass (1526), as shown above, was distinguished for brevity and simplicity—being briefer and simpler than was Zwingli's service of 1525, which, as both Alt and Krauth declare, closely fol-

lows Luther's Formula Missae, and which, because of its elaborateness, and its *extremely responsive* character, stands in marked contrast with the liturgies of South Germany,*

So early as the year 1526, John Brentz, who through Luther's German Mass, is the father of the South German Liturgies, composed the order for Swabian Hall. He omits the Prefaces which Zwingli retained; also omits the Epistle and Sanctus, and *expressly* aims at restoring the Mass to its *original simplicity*, "as it was instituted by Christ and administered in the ancient Church." At this time Calvin was only seventeen years old, and it is impossible to conclude that Brentz was influenced by Zwingli, for not only is Zwingli's Service much longer and more elaborate than Luther's German Mass, (and quite different in its structure from both the German Mass and the Swabian-Hall), but already the year before (1525) Brentz had begun controversy with Zwingli and Ecolampadius in the celebrated *Swabian Syngramma*, which Luther twice republished, each time with a preface written by himself.† Nor is it to be supposed for one moment that Erhard Schnepf was influenced by Zwingli's Service, when he prepared the First Württemberg in 1536, for he had assisted Brentz in the composition of the *Syngramma*; and it was only in this year that Calvin came to Geneva, and he had not yet turned his hand to the preparation of a liturgy. Therefore it is *historically certain* that the *Reformed could have exerted no influence* in laying the *foundation* of the liturgies of South Germany. In the characteristics of brevity and simplicity they are *unquestionably* LUTHERAN, and have as their prime models Luther's German Mass, and the Swabian-Hall of 1526, 1543, and the Württemberg of 1553.‡ Nor is the Communion Sermon confined to these *Unirenden*. The Cologne Reformation (1543), which Dr. Krauth vindicates as a Lutheran liturgy as over against Dr. Shield's claim that it is Calvinistic, and which is recognized as Lutheran by all the great Liturgical writers, appoints

*Zwingli's Werke. 2. II. p. 235 et seq. †Works, vol., 65, p. 179.

‡Whatever very slight influence in ceremonies may possibly have been exerted by Blaurer on the Württemberg of 1536 was purged away, (according to Dr. Horn, a most competent authority and member of the Committee on Common Service, see below) by Brentz in the Württemberg of 1553.

"Ein Unterricht oder Predige vom Heyligen Nachtmal." And the Saxon General Articles (1557) ordered that Communion be held so often as there are persons who desire it, which is exactly in accord with the "*Unirenden*." (Ritter. II. 180.)

But that the South German Churches were *subsequently* influenced in *rutes* and *ceremonies* by the Reformed, cannot be denied. It is not possible for two such powerful bodies to live side by side for generations without influencing each other. Hence, Kliefoth says that the Lutherans become less liturgical and the Reformed more so; but this reciprocal influence was scarcely so much felt in the matter of worship, as in some other ceremonies of the Church. And this process of reciprocal influence is going on yet, deny it who may, or oppose it who will; and there are at least a few Lutherans in this country intelligent enough to know with Dr. Krauth, that "at the time of the hottest controversies between the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches, when the differences were magnified on both sides to the last degree, it was never pretended by either party that there was any diversity in regard to the principles of public worship involved in the discussion. The Reformed and Lutheran Churches were a unit as to every *principle* of worship which now divides the German Reformed Church. The history of the two Churches demonstrates that it was conceded on both sides, that if there were doctrinal harmony, the questions of public worship would settle themselves. Both Communion hold that the Church of each country has the right *pro re nata*, to change and order all matters of worship not fixed by God's word, as her best interests may, in each case demand;" and there are a good many thousands of Lutherans in America, who are syncretistic enough to ask with the same great man: "Shall either of the Churches, where time has been working its quiet changes, go back merely for tradition's sake, to the old forms and revive, without reason, the dead, old disputes? Shall we have exorcism and the Latin hymns back again in the Lutheran Church—because she once had them,—and shall the German Reformed melt down her silver communion cups, and burn up her organs, because she once disapproved of them? Shall we not rather thank God as any real healing is seen in any part of his bleeding Church, and es-

pecially if, not by compromise of principles, but by genuine growth in them, the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, with so great a work in common, are able at any point to approach each other?*

2. *The authors of the South German Liturgies.*

(a.) *John Brentz* is unquestionably the father of the South German Lutheran liturgies. Any attempt to vindicate the Lutheran soundness of this great man, would presuppose the reader's ignorance of the history of the Reformation. We let Dr. Krauth speak: "Brentius, whose name, in the department of polemic theology, is mentioned next that of Luther and of Melancthon in the early history of the Reformation—Brentius, who stood so high in the judgment of Luther himself, one of the acutest judges of character, to whom Luther applied terms of commendation which seemed so near an approach to flattery, that he felt it necessary to protest that he is speaking in godly sincerity, whom he compared, in relation to himself, to the 'still small voice following the whirlwind, earthquake and fire,'—Brentius, whose contributions to sacred interpretation not only stood in highest repute in his own land, but several of which had sufficient reputation to lead to their translation in England * * and whose writing are still consulted with delight by the scholar, and republished"†—surely such a man ought not to be charged with having written an impure liturgy. Or if such a charge be made, we ask for testimony from Brentz's own contemporaries. Who of his time called any one of his four liturgies *impure*?

(b.) *Erhard Schnepf*, together with Blaurer, composed the Württemberg KO. of 1536, but not until they had agreed on the following formula: "*Corpus et Sanguinem vere, i. e. substantialiter*

**Mercersburg Review* for 1869, pp. 643, 646, where the differences between the two Churches are fully presented by Dr. Krauth. But if the Lutheran and Reformed of the sixteenth century were one in every principle involved, how can one class of Lutheran liturgies be called with reference to the Reformed, *pure* and another class *impure*? The words *purity* and *impurity* express qualities which are directly antagonistic to each other in principle. If the Lutheran and Reformed Liturgies held no such relation to each other, how could or how can the Lutheran Liturgies of Northern and Southern Germany hold such relation?

†*Conservative Reformation*, p. 76, n.

et essentialiter, non autem quantitative vel localiter praesentia esse et exuberare in Cæna."* Schnepf was at the Diet of Augsburg, signed the Smalcald Articles, and was regarded as one of the most strenuous Lutherans of his age. Blaurer† had been a pupil of Zwingli, but after signing the above given formula in regard to the Lord's Supper, and after satisfying Schnepf and Brentz of his Lutheran soundness, we see no reason why he might not be quite as competent to assist in the composition of a Lutheran liturgy, as a man could be in our day who had been educated in a Congregational college and a Presbyterian seminary.

(c.) *Luke Osiander*, next to Melancthon, was the most learned man of the original Lutheran Reformers. His liturgical pedigree will be established when it is known that he was the chief author of the great Brandenburg-Nuremberg KO. of 1533, "which became the foundation of many other Agenda"—Klöpffer (*Liturgik*, p. 166).

(d.) *Bucer*, who was called "a tainted man," (see above p. 128). But from a judgment so harsh we appeal, first, to the Preface of the COMMON SERVICE in hand, which calls him simply a *Lutheran Professor*, and, secondly, to Dr. Krauth, who says: "Melancthon and Bucer were both Lutherans. However mild, irenical, and unionistic they might be, they were both adherents of the Augsburg Confession, declaring that they held it from the heart as their faith. Bucer signed the Augsburg Confession in 1532. In the Wittenberg Concord of 1536, Bucer came to a full concord with Luther in the faith, even to the last point of contest, 'that the unworthy truly take the body and blood of Christ, though to their own judgment.' At the consummation of this Concord, Bucer and Capito shed tears of joy. 'From the year 1536,' says Diefenbach, 'Bucer was thoroughly Lutheran:' and Schenkel, who would gladly have reached another conclusion,

*Kurtz, *Ch. Hist.*, Vol. II., p. 79.

†Among the doctors and ministers at Smalcald who declare and "unanimously profess that they believe, and teach in their several churches, agreeably to the articles of the Confession and Apology," is Ambrose Blaurer. See Smalcald Arts. Appendix.

says: 'That in the Wittenberg Concord, Bucer ceased to hold his earlier conviction, that he was overcome by Luther's authority, and that his zeal for union carried him away to the recantation of the Swiss doctrine, is a fact which no sophistry can set aside.' (Herzog, Real Enc., Art. Bucer). The most violent feeling was roused against Bucer among the Reformed on the Continent, and he was styled in bitter sarcasm: 'Luther's Cardinal a latere.'

"Lathbury shows that Bucer was the object of intense hatred to many of the Calvinists in England, because of his adherence to the doctrine (to use Bucer's own words) of 'the real and substantial presence of Christ in the Sacrament,' in which doctrine he remained steadfast to his death. Guericke says: 'Bucer went to England, and even there held firmly to the pure evangelical' (Lutheran) 'doctrine; deeply deploring its imperilling by the rationalizing tendency which prevailed.' In 1537 among the 'Doctors and preachers who subscribed the Augsburg Confession and its apology,' appears the name of Martin Bucer, attached to the Appendix to the Smalcald Articles. Melancthon says to Luther (1543) 'Both Bucer and Pistorius teach purely and rightly.'

"That Melancthon and Bucer were on terms of personal friendship with Calvin, no more proves them to be Calvinists than our hearty admiration of Dr. Shields makes us a Calvinist. Calvin never praised either of them as ardently as he did Luther; and it is pretty well settled that Luther was not a Calvinist—although more largely than many imagine Calvin was a Lutheran."*

Thus it would seem that the South German Liturgies and KOO. have a very fair paternity. Men who signed the Augsburg Confession again and again, and other Lutheran formulae, could hardly have composed *impure* Lutheran Liturgies, albeit they may have preferred to follow Luther's German Mass, and to curtail the number of festal days, and to modify some *rites* and *ceremonies*. But in doing this they followed Luther's later and maturer judgment, and, as Alt says, showed themselves more *independent*. It is certain that neither Luther nor Me-

**Mercersburg Review*, 1869, 601.

lanchthon nor any member of the Wittenberg Faculty, reproached them for their preference. It strikes us that it is a little too late in the Christian era for men to defame their characters or to impeach their work. A grand paternity have these South German liturgies—Luther, Brentz, Schnepf, Blaurer, Osiander, Bucer, and to a degree even Melanchthon, as we shall hereafter see. Any imputation upon the liturgies which they composed and endorsed, is an imputation upon the men themselves.

3. *The Liturgies Themselves.**

(a.) *The First Würtemberg* (1536). As just shown, this was the work of Schnepf and Blaurer, "examined and approved by Brentz," says Dr. Horn (*Luth. Ch. Rev.* I. p. 272), who further states: "Blaurer objected that Brentz wished to introduced too much that was superstitious, and instanced his requirement that only so many wafers should be placed on the altar as there would be communicants to receive them. He was able to override Brentz's preference for the chor-rock, but Brentz and Schnepf insisted on retaining absolution." But Dr. Horn objects not one word about doctrine, for to do that would at once impeach the doctrinal soundness of Schnepf and Brentz, and that again would be to contradict his own compliment to the latter: "It will not be necessary to prove Brentz's eminence as a man and a Reformer." Surely Dr. Horn would not contend that the battle of the Liturgies is to be fought out over a few wafers and a *chor-rock*.

(b.) *The Swabian Hall*, (1543). This is Brentz's own work.

*We have read in a recent publication that the South German Churches were influenced in their Cultus by Carlstadt, but no proof is given. After leaving Wittenberg in 1524, Carlstadt forced himself into Orlamund, whence he was expelled the same year. He then went to Strassburg, where he prejudiced the minds of Bucer and Capito against Luther; but in the year 1525, was published the first Strassburg Liturgy, which is almost identical with the *Formula Missae*, except that it is still more closely modeled after the Romish Mass. Löhle classes this liturgy with Bugenhagen, Döber, Urfuth, and is much influenced by it in his own liturgical work. Schmucker speaks of it with high praise. It is certain, as shown above, that no influence came into the Lutheran Cultus from Switzerland, whither Carlstadt went from Strassburg. We are not aware that Carlstadt either composed or assisted in composing a liturgy.

Says Dr. Horn: "It is free from the Calvinistic deformities of 1536, and in basing it on the Brandenburg-Nuremberg KO. of 1533, he (Brentz) justified our use of the latter as the real exponent of his views," p. 273. Those who know something of Dr. Horn's excellent liturgical scholarship, and of his extreme views of doctrine, will regard this as as strong testimony to the purity and the Lutheran soundness of a liturgy, which so distinguished a critic and judge as Alt (*Kirchen-Jahr*, p. 446), regards as one of the foundation liturgies of South Germany.

The "Calvinistic deformities" to which Dr. Horn alludes, have already been mentioned—a few wafers and the *chor-rock* (cope). He makes no reference whatever to the chief South German characteristic of the liturgy of 1536, viz., *that it orders the communion to be held every two months*. To have found fault at this point would doubtless have been to have found fault with his own custom. But we must protest that it is anachronistic to talk about "Calvinistic deformities" at that time, 1536. We must repeat that Calvin did not come to Geneva until in that year, that he remained there only two years, and then spent three years at Strassburg, where he subscribed the Augsburg Confession (Krauth's *Conserv. Ref.*, p. 180), and acted as a Lutheran minister; and "that Calvin was not at this time opposed to the practices of the Lutheran Church, and that he wished to establish the rite of confession, as exercised among the Lutherans, appears from a letter to Farel, in which particular mention is made of this part of discipline."* His own Liturgy did not appear until 1543. Far more probable is it that he was influenced by the Lutherans, than that the Lutherans were influenced by him, for by this time the type of South German liturgy, was fully established, both in regard to the interval between the celebrations of the Lord's Supper, and the relation of the sermon thereto. All this is fully established by the outline of the Swabian-Hall (1543), which Dr. Horn gives as follows: "Begins with proper *Introit*. After the Collect a gradual, Alleluia or Sequence. Then the Gospel. The Nicene Creed Then shall follow the Communion with German Exhortation, Consecration,

*Henry's *Life of Calvin*, I., p. 141. Baird's *Eutaxia*, p. 21.

and distribution, the scholars meanwhile singing the *Sanctus*. The Creed in German, or a spiritual song suitable to the time. The Sermon. General Prayer. Alms. German Song." This, be it remembered, is the liturgy of which Dr. Horn says: "It is free from the Calvinistic deformities of 1536." That is, it is a pure Lutheran liturgy. No fault is found with the place of the sermon.

(c.) "In 1553 Brentz prepared the *Great Württemberg KO.*, in which he was able to correct some of the peculiarities of 1536. He based this on his own work of 1543. This KO. through the great influence of Duke Christopher of Württemberg, became a model of many churches of other countries and cities." (Dr. Horn, *Ch. Review*, I., p. 273). Here Dr. Horn speaks of two things worthy of notice: The one is that there were only "irregularities" in the liturgy of 1536, and the other that the *Württemberg* of 1553 "became a model." Evidently Dr. Horn regards it with too much favor to call it "impure," or to intimate that the churches which modeled their liturgies on it were not Lutheran. He finds no fault with it because it proposes to celebrate the Lord's Supper once a month, or every fortnight. But there is yet other testimony in regard to this *Great Württemberg*. Daniel says: "It is agreed by all that this was a model for many others" (*quam multis aliis exemplo fuisse inter omnes constat*). Similar testimony is borne by Richter in the Preface to Vol. II. of the KOO. It also testifies of itself. In its preface it binds itself to the Augsburg Confession, and to the *Württemberg* Confession, and declares: "We will and require that our pastors and preachers, and our other church-ministers shall teach and perform church-acts in disputed and in other points, according to the contents, the directions, and the explanations of the two confessions mentioned." It also contains John Brentz's Catechism, which is still in use in *Württemberg*, and which no man will impeach as un-Lutheran. In the preface to the ceremony of the Lord's Supper, it says: "In regard to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper we hold it outright (*stracks*) according to the meaning of the word of Christ as it is explained in

the Augsburg Confession and in our own Confession,* viz., that in the Supper of Christ the body and blood of Christ are truly and actually communicated with bread and wine, are received and partaken of,† p. 25. (See also Daniel, *Cod. Lit.* II. p. 133). In order that this statement may have its full force we call attention to the fact that up to this time, namely, the middle of the sixteenth century, the Lord's Supper was the only doctrine fairly in dispute between the Lutherans and the Reformed. At Marburg (1529) the Lutherans and the Zwinglians had agreed on fourteen and a half articles, and had disagreed only in regard to Christ's bodily presence in the Eucharist. The Predestinarian Controversy had not yet arisen.

(e.) *The Württemberg Seminary (Summarischer Begriff)* (1559) plants itself squarely on "the Prophetic and Apostolic Scriptures, also the Augsburg and our Confession; but chiefly in regard to the articles wherein at this time there is controversy, not only with the Papacy, and other false religions and beliefs, but also with all kinds of sects, shall candidates be examined." Then follows a series of questions to be addressed to candidates for ordination, which reveal the most positive Lutheranism, even down to the eating of the body of Christ by the unworthy.

(f.) *The Pfalz-Neuberg* (1543) was composed by Osiander. The name of the author is sufficient guarantee for its character. Much of it is taken from the Brandenburg-Nuremberg, as was to be expected. It is a tolerable full liturgy, and exhibits the staunchest Lutheranism. It is referred to here chiefly because it is a witness of the pure Lutheranism of the country in which it

*By "our own Confession" is meant the *Confessio Württembergica*, prepared by ten Swabian divines and the city of Strassburg in 1551, to be sent to Trent. It was approved by the Wittenberg Faculty. It remained in use up to the beginning of the present century.

†The Exhortation to the communicants is taken from the great Brandenburg-Nuremberg (1533), as are also the words of distribution, "Take and eat, this is the body of Christ, given for you." "Take and drink, this is the blood of Christ, shed for thy sins." The COMMON SERVICE took its words of distribution from the same source. The Württemberg of 1553, as does also the Swabian-Hall 1543, restores the *chor-rock*, which was thrown out by "Calvinistic deformity," according to Dr. Horn.

was used. Its words of distribution are taken from the Brandenburg-Nuremberg.

(g.) *The Ott-Heinrich*, mentioned by Kliefoth (see p. 130), is based on the Württemberg, and differs very little from it. It declares its doctrinal basis to be the three ecumenical creeds, "and in harmony with these the Augsburg Confession."*

(h.) *The Strassburg* (1534) contains the following: "In the Lord's Supper Christ himself becomes to us the food of eternal life, and his true body and true blood are communicated and given, and are truly received from the fingers of the Lord and partaken of (genossen). By this is meant not that the bread must be the very body of Christ, and the wine, the blood; or that the bread and the wine are changed into the body and blood—but with the bread and wine together with the words, the true body and blood are given to us."† Comment is unnecessary, except to say that Dr. Krauth declares: "Strassburg received the Augsburg Confession in 1532, and never become Calvinistic," (*Mercersburg Rev.* 1869, p. 605),—a statement which is corroborated by "The Consensus between the theologians and professors in the University and Church of Strassburg, March 18, 1563," in which the Augsburg Confession and the Apology are accepted as "the form and rule of all doctrine, not only in regard to the Lord's Supper, but also in regard to other articles," and further: "It is agreed that the Formula of Concord between Martin Luther and Martin Bucer of blessed memory, the ministers of the Churches of Saxony and of Upper Germany, be followed by all in teaching." (Pfaff's *Acta et Scripta Eccl. Würt.* p. 358).

(i.) *The Strassburg* of 1598. Says Richter: "In this KO. the triumph of Lutheranism in Strassburg seems complete" (II. p. 479). On page 238 this KO. requires all candidates for holy orders to subscribe the "Confession, the Apology and the Formula of Concord." The formula of subscription is very stringent.

(j.) *The Frankfurt* (1530) is founded on Luther's German Mass, and declares that in the Lord's Supper we have to do not with mere bread and wine but with the flesh and blood of Christ.

*Richter, KOO. II. p. 146.

†Richter, KOO. I. p. 231.

(k.) *The Worms* (1560) is taken from the Würtemberg. Says Richter: "In reality it is the Würtemberg KO. or one of those borrowed from it." It declares that the "proof and explanation of all controverted articles, must be sought and obtained from the ancient symbols, the Confession, the Catechism, the Confession of Luther, the *Loci* of Melanchthon and the Wittenberg Examen Ordinandorum." We should pronounce this a pretty strong Lutheran basis.

(l.) *The Hohenlohe* (1577) plants itself on "the writings of the prophets and apostles of the Old and New Testaments as the *norma judicii*, the three ancient symbols, the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, Luther's Catechism, the Repetition of the Augsburg Confessions, the *Loci* of Melanchthon, and the present KO. The other writings of our teachers shall be understood and explained according to this body of doctrine; but the controversial writings and impure books of the Papists, the Calvinists *et al.*, shall not be used."* We are ready to believe that no Lutheran of the sixteenth century ever charged impurity upon this KO. Its sources also are good—the Würtemberg Summary (1559), the Saxon (1539), and the Nuremberg.

(m.) *The Mompelgart* is an abridgment of the Würtemberg Summary (1559). This is sufficient guarantee for its orthodoxy.

(n.) *The Hanau* (1573) is closely conformed to the Würtemberg Summary, and requires that its pastors shall teach according to the Augsburg Confession, and shall not become infected with the errors of the Papists, the Zwinglians and the Anabaptists.

(o.) *The Palatinate* (1557, second edition in 1560, a third in 1563, a fourth in 1570). (Richter, II., p. 194). The large folio stands before us. The order of the Lord's Supper was taken principally from the Mecklenburg of 1554, but without the *Preface* and the *Benedicamus*, which are generally omitted from the Liturgies of South Germany, in imitation of Luther's German Mass, and the Swabian-Hall. It was submitted to Melanchthon,

*Richter, II. p. 400. It is proper to explain that Richter's KOO. is a large double volume, containing the essential parts of nearly all the liturgies of the sixteenth century, with valuable historical notes.

who made numerous suggestions which were adopted. (Richter II. p. 194). Melanchthon's suggestions are found in *Corpus Reformatorum*, vol. VIII. pp. 938-9. He adds: "I, Philip Melanchthon, have read your writing, and approve the doctrine recited in this writing, and declare (judico) that it agrees with the Confession of the churches which in the dominion of the Dukes of Saxony, and in the cities of Saxony embrace the Augsburg Confession, and I judge that the churches are able to use in a godly manner the rites which are here set forth."

The significance of this testimony is, that it approves both the doctrine and the *rites* of this South German Ordnung, thus showing conclusively that in the judgment of this great theologian, the churches of the Palatinate, which used this Order were in the unity of one and the same pure faith, and that the *rites* of these South German churches were not a subject for cavil. This Kirchen-Ordnung was also submitted to Brentz. He expressed himself in general well pleased with it, but suggested less severity towards the Anabaptists, and greater brevity in the ceremony of the Lord's Supper. This is doubly significant (*Corp. Ref.* VIII. p. 938). In the preface this KO. binds itself unqualifiedly to the Augsburg Confession, the Smalcald Articles and to Melanchthon's *Loc.* On page 97 it sets forth its view of the Lord's Supper exactly in the words of the Würtemberg of 1553, which shows the wide influence of this typical South German Order. "Hold!" says some one, "This is a pure Lutheran Liturgy." "Hold!" say we. On page 97 it orders that the "Communion may be held once a month, or every two weeks, or so often as there are communicants present," which, according to Klieforth (see p. 129), is one of the chief characteristics of the *Unrenden*; and, besides, as already noted, it omits the *Preface* and the *Benedicamus*. The sermon is on the Gospel lesson, as is also the case in the Würtemberg and some other South German KOO.

(o.) *The Erbach*, 1560. This was sent to the Diet of Worms (1557) to Melanchthon and Brentz for examination. On the third of December 1557 Melanchthon wrote to the Counts who had sent it: "The Rev. Dr. Brentz and I have carefully read

your book. The order of rites does not displease us, but we have made some suggestions in regard to the phraseology, and in regard to the doctrine of repentance." *Corpus Ref.* IX. p. 392. The suggestions follow. Some of these suggestions were inserted, and the book was published in the year 1560. Thus Melancthon and Brentz became in part authors of the *Erbach Ordnung*, which was founded partly on the *Nuremberg*. "Der Ritus aber ist abgekürzt" (Admonition, Words of Institution, Thanksgiving, Benediction), says Richter, (II. 223). Are we prepared to say that an order of service which was approved by Melancthon and Brentz is to be regarded as not a *pure* Lutheran Liturgy?

(p.) *The Rhein-Pfalz* (1577) declares in its Preface that all doctrines, explanations and ceremonies, must be in accord with the Augsburg Confession.

But we are tired of this endless repetition, and so doubtless is the reader. It is the same thing over and over again. These South German *Kirchenordnungen* pledge themselves to the Lutheran faith and confessions in language the most unequivocal, and just as decisive and emphatic as can be found in the *Ordnungen* of Northern Germany. And this, it must ever be understood, is the true test of a Lutheran Church,—*doctrine*, not rites and ceremonies; and in their doctrinal and catechetical sections these South German KOO. set forth the pure Lutheran faith in every article. We do not say, however, that absolutely no one of the *Unirenden* bearing a Lutheran name ever contained a *taint* of Calvinistic doctrine. We are not learned enough to make any such assertion. We are certain that the many which we have examined, proceed everywhere on the supposition that they are absolutely free from such taint, and we are certain that neither Klöpfer, nor Alt, nor Daniel, nor Kliefoth, nor Krauth, nor Harnack, nor Löhe (Horn who discusses and analyzes four of these South German liturgies, declares in a summary, "The Lutheran doctrine insisted on"), makes any imputations upon the doctrine of these *Unirenden*. Nor have we discovered anywhere that in the sixteenth century the churches of South Germany, or their *Ordnungen*, were charged with being un-Lutheran. Moreover, it must not be forgotten that Jacob Andreae, a Wür-

temberg theologian was the chief author of the Form of Concord, that John Brentz, the father of the South German liturgies, was the originator of some of the strongest statements in that famous Formula, and that to these two, Martin Chemnitz and all Northern Germany bowed in submission, without charging impurity upon the liturgies of South Germany. These are facts which ought to count for something when we come to form a judgment of the liturgies and Ordnungen of South Germany. That some of the South German churches did pass over to the Reformed, is true; but so did Brandenburg; so did Hesse (which Dr. Krauth especially calls Lutheran); and finally all Germany passed over to Rationalism. Did this occur because their churches did not have pure Lutheran Liturgies? But it is a fact that these South German churches have always been most distinguished for piety, and they were the last to yield to the Illumination of the eighteenth century, which came from the North. (Kurtz, *Ch. Hist.* II. p. 289).

So far as we have been able to ascertain, Kliefoth (1847) was the first to classify the Northern German Liturgies as *Der ächte Typus*, and those of South Germany as *Die Unurenden*. Alt in his *Christliche Cultus* (1843) distinguishes them respectively as those of the churches which had greater attachment for the *Roman Ritual*, and those of the churches which had greater *independence*. In his *Kirchen-Jahr* (1860) he adopts Kliefoth's designation for the South German class, but calls Kliefoth's *der ächte Typus* "The Catholicizing." If we were so disposed we might offset the authority and classification of one of these most learned and competent judges by the authority and classification of the other, and say, We will have nothing to do with the Liturgies of Northern Germany, because they are *Catholicizing* in festivals and usages. But it is evident that each makes his designation for purposes of scientific distinction, without any reference whatever to difference in doctrine. Yet it is important to remember that Alt claims the Liturgies of Saxony as "*the Lutheran Evangelical*." Klöpper and Krauth make no discriminations, but claim all alike as *Lutheran*. Harnack, as already observed, simply parts them into the Majoritäts Praxis and the Minoritäts Praxis of the Lutheran Agenda of the XVI.

and XVII. centuries. Löhe (p. 59.), under the heading: "The Second Part of the Mass according to the Widest Usage in the Lutheran Church," names twenty-three liturgies, six of which are classed by Harnack and Kliefoth with the South German liturgies, but he makes no distinction whatever, either in regard to doctrine or ceremonies. With all these authorities, the Lutheran Liturgies of the sixteenth century are *Lutheran Liturgies*, which they could not be, and which they could not be called honestly, did they not contain Lutheran *doctrine*, for it is Lutheran *doctrine*, not ceremonies and usages, which entitles a church, a creed, a liturgy, to be called *Lutheran*. Now, of the Lutheran Liturgies of the sixteenth century, there are evidently two, if not three types. But,—to repeat for the purpose of emphasis,—the class called by Kliefoth *Der ächte Typus*, Alt, who is equally learned and equally capable as a judge and critic, calls *Catholicizing*, because it holds on to the Roman Catholic forms of the Divine Service; and he selects another class as the true "Lutheran Evangelical" Liturgy. Both unite in calling another type *Die Unirenden*. But the doctrine is *absolutely* one and the same in each class. Hence the question at issue resolves itself very much into this: Shall we accept the *Formula Missae* (which both Alt and Krauth declare was intended "to be used *for a time*"), and the liturgies founded thereon, which, as all learned critics declare, and as a little examination will teach any one, retain many Roman Catholic forms and ceremonies and usages,—shall we accept *this* class as the true type? Or shall we accept the German Mass, which embodies Luther's later and more mature conclusions, and the simpler liturgies based thereon, which have been slightly modified in a very few rites and ceremonies by contact with the Reformed, which rites and ceremonies, according to Dr. Krauth, involved no difference in *principle*,—shall we accept *these* as the true type? The answers which different men will give to these questions, will be determined very much by the answer which they shall have given first to the question: Shall we have a long and elaborate liturgical service with many festal days, or shall we have a brief and simple one, with only the chief festivals of the Church? In favor of the latter alternative is the judgment and liturgical taste of Luther, and Brentz,

and Spangenberg, and the practice of the whole Faculty and University of Wittenberg, who used the German Mass and the First Wittenberg of 1533, (see p. 116).

IV.

We come now to a more minute examination of the COMMON SERVICE

For the sake of convenience and greater clearness, we divide it into four principal sections, following Kliefoth.

1. The first section extends to and includes the *Gloria in Excelsis*.

(a.) *The Invocation*, "In the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen." We have not been able to find this as the opening of the Communion Service, in any of the many North German Lutheran liturgies of the sixteenth century, which we have examined. It is not found in Löhe's second edition, 1852, but is in the third edition* (1883). It begins the Ordinary of the Roman Mass.

(b.) *The Adjutorium*, "Our help is in the name of the Lord," etc. Klöpffer says (p. 166) this came into the Mecklenburg from the Reformed. It is the opening sentence of Calvin's Liturgy of 1543. Alt (p. 282) notices it as part of the *Weiheformel* of the Romish Mass, and Krauth says it was taken from the Romish Mass. From the Mecklenburg it passed into the Wittenberg† of 1559, and into the Palatinate of 1560 and into some others. It does not by any means have "the common consent" of even the few liturgies which begin the Service with the *Confiteor*. Of course it is in Löhe.

(c.) The verses, "I said, I will confess my transgressions

*The Rev. William Löhe, Lutheran pastor at New Dettelsau, Germany, published a liturgy in 1844. In 1852 he issued a new and enlarged edition. In 1883 a third edition was issued by Rev. William Deinzer. Prof. Lutz writes: "Deinzer prepared the third edition according to the wishes of the clergy of the Iowa Synod, but did not change anything in the Communio, except that he added the 'Oratio Fractionis,' which was a footnote in the second edition." A comparison of the two does show, however, a couple other small changes, which we notice elsewhere.

†"A reprint from the Mecklenburg KO. of the edition of 1554," says Richter, II. p. 222.

unto the Lord. And thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin," we have found in the Cologne Reformation of 1543, which was but little used in the land in which it originated, and which cannot be claimed as "standard." Luther was angry with Melancthon and Bucer about it, and the Elector himself was dissatisfied both with the doctrine and the ceremonies* (Seckendorf, III. 437). It dealt too softly with Rome. These versicles are found in the Austrian of 1571 *as an alternative form*. But this Order is one of the most elaborate. Both Kapp and Klöpfer declare that "it closely follows the Roman Mass." We are certain that these versicles can lay no *shadow* of claim to "the common consent." As might be expected, they are in Löhe. *But they are not in the Harrisburg Report* (Minutes of the Gen. Synod (1885), p. 18), and every liturgical scholar knows that they form no part of the *Confiteor* promised in that Report. The Confession proper (double form) and the Absolution are taken from the Mecklenburg, as is also one of the alternatives in Löhe. Richter says that this first part of this service was taken from John Reibling's Order of the Mass of 1540. But this double form of Confession, one part to be said by the Priest, and the other by his assistant—in the COMMON SERVICE, the first part to be said by the minister, and the second part by the congregation with the minister,—does not have "the common consent" of even the *few* liturgies which place a *Confiteor*† before the Introit. "The common consent" would give a *simpler*, a less complicated form. In the Brandenburg-Nuremberg the Priest is directed simply to say the *Confiteor*, or whatever his devotions may bring to his mind. The Veit Dietrich directs the Priest to pray the *Confiteor*. In both these cases the *Confiteor* is probably the *Beichtgebet des Priesters*, that is, the minister's own private devotion

*Daniel calls the Baptismal formula of this liturgy, "Luthero-Romanizing." *Cod. Lit.* II. p. 202.

†By the *Confiteor* we mean *all* that precedes the Introit. The great majority of the Lutheran liturgies, following the example of Luther, begin the service with the Introit, which may consist of the (Scripture) verse the Psalm (verse) and the Gloria Patri. But the Gloria Patri is by *no means* always used. It is frequently omitted when the Introit is a Psalm or Hymn. It does not find place in the German Mass. Spangenberg uses it more frequently in the Latin Service, than in the German.

at the altar. In the Cologne, the congregation is directed to make the Confession; and the minister, to pronounce the Absolution. In the Pomeranian the Priest makes a confessional prayer for himself; after this immediately the service opens with the Introit.

But why discuss the various parts of which *this* CONFITEOR, and that of Löhe, are composed? It must be said not only that no such *elaborate* and *composite* CONFITEOR, can be found among the *standard, representative* Lutheran Liturgies of the sixteenth century, but that the *Confiteor* as such lacks "the common consent." The *great majority* of the Lutheran Liturgies are *absolutely* without the *Confiteor*. The Mecklenburg directs that the *Communion* shall begin "with the public confession, prayer and absolution," and says, "as is the custom in this country." The Wittenberg, after directing the service to be opened with the same forms, adds, "As it is in some countries." This at once shows limitation, especially since the word *etliche* (and einige), according to Adler, conveys the idea of "more than two, but not many." Says Klieforth: "A few (einige) KOO. place also the *Confiteor* before the Introit. In the ancient Christian Divine Service each member on entering the congregation, made for himself a silent confession of sin, just as we are accustomed now to say a silent Lord's Prayer. In the later Greek Church, there took place before the Divine Service of the congregation, an act between the Priest and his assistant, by which they prepared themselves spiritually for the spiritual act which they were about to perform. This the Romish Church adopted, and placed before the opening of the Mass Service with the Introit an act by which the Priest makes the confessional prayer, and the attendant responds in the name of the people; whereupon the Priest pronounces the Absolution. Of this act of preparation (which in the Mass-Ritual had added to it many invocations of the saints) have a few (einige) Lutheran *Ordnungen* retained so much, that the minister opens the service every time with the reading of a general Confession and Absolution. Nevertheless the most (*die meisten*) of the KOO. have omitted it, because the Confession (*Beichte*) is indeed contained in the Kyrie. It is thus made certain that the true type (*der ächte Typus*) of this first section con-

sists of the triad of the Introit (oder Eingangslied), the Kyrie and the *Gloria in Excelsis*," p. 152-3. And on p. 162 he says: "The Lutheran Church did not lay much stress on this general confession; what thereof was necessary lay in the Kyrie and the *Gloria*. She also regarded the sermon itself, the preaching of the word, essentially as a general confession and absolution. And besides, she had among the subordinate services which precede the Communion, a special Confession-service, namely, the service on Saturday afternoon."

This testimony of Kliefoth (which our own examination confirms) settles the question of "the common consent" emphatically against the *Confiteor*, that is, against all, in the COMMON SERVICE, which stands before the Introit. But what is especially noteworthy in the testimony of Kliefoth is, that he uses the words *der ächte Typus*, the very words which he so constantly employs to embrace the Northern German liturgies as over against those of South Germany. And if it be said that some of those which do not have a *Confiteor* before the Introit, do nevertheless have it further on in the service, then we reply again in the language of Kliefoth: "Only a few of the extreme type," (*nur wenige KOO. von dem strengen Typus*). Even should we take "the common consent" of the four which the COMMON SERVICE calls *standard*, viz., Henry of Saxony, Mecklenburg, Lüneberg and Calenberg, we will find that the vote against the *Confiteor* stands three to one. Spangenberg's great work* (1545), with a Latin title: *Cantiones Ecclesiasticae*, and a German title: *Kirchen-Gesänge Deutsch*, provides a service with

*This is one of the most important manuals of devotion issued in the sixteenth century. Says Dr. Schmucker: "Prepared at Luther's entreaty it gives the whole service of the Lutheran Church with all its varying parts for all the Sundays and Festivals of the Church Year and music for them." *Church Rev.* 1882, p. 169. It has the following parts for the full Communion Service: Opening Hymn; Collect; Kyrie; Gloria in Excelsis; Collect; Epistle; Hymn; Gospel; Creed; Sermon; Preface, without Salutation and Sursum Corda; Sanctus; Paraphrase of the Lord's Prayer as Exhortation; Words of Institution; Communion with appropriate singing; Thanksgiving Collect; Benediction; Da Pacem. It has neither salutations nor responses. No doubt it well reflects Luther's liturgical taste and judgment.

music in the Latin language, and a corresponding one in German, for every Sunday in the year. But in neither one is there a *Confiteor*. The Latin directs: "The *Veni Sancte Spiritus* is to be sung at the opening of every Mass Service;" then follows a very brief "Collect," then the Introit. The German directs: "At the beginning of every Divine Service shall be sung the German *Veni Sancte Spiritus*, the 'Kom heiliger Geist, etc.'" This is followed by a "Collecta Deutsch." Then comes the Kyrie. Daniel (*Cod. Lit.* II. p. 125) says that Ludecus, in his *Missale Havelbergense*, (1585) "mentions neither minister nor *Confiteor*." Neither of Luther's Services contains a *Confiteor*; neither is there any in the Wittenberg of 1533, which was used "thereafter by both Luther and Bugenhagen," and by the Wittenberg Faculty.*

How now is it possible for us to reconcile these facts with the statement found in the Preface before us: "The Common Service here presented is intended to reproduce in English the *Consensus* of these pure liturgies"? The reader may solve the enigma as best he can.

2. "The Second Section consists commonly of the Salutation, the Collect, the Reading of the Epistle, the Hymn (*Zwischengesang*) and the Reading of the Gospel." (Kliefoth, p. 153).

(a.) The rubrics in this part of the COMMON SERVICE, which announce the Epistle and Gospel respectively, viz., "The Epistle for—(*here he shall name the day*) is written in the—Chapter of—beginning at the—Verse." "Here endeth the Epistle." "The Holy Gospel is written in the—Chapter of St.—beginning at the—Verse." "Here endeth the Gospel," are taken *verbatim et literatim* from the Church Book of the General Council. As they appear in the COMMON SERVICE, they are, we have been positively assured, a conscious imitation of the English Book of Common Prayer. But these rubrics even go beyond the English Book in ritualistic formality, since

*In the *Lutheran* of May, 14, 1885, Dr. Schmucker declares: "Most of them (the liturgies of Northern Germany) have no confession of sins at the opening, and no *Nunc Dimittis* near the close."

they require the specification of the day, and add: "Here endeth the Gospel."

Now all this is in very marked contrast with the simplicity which prevails in the Lutheran liturgies of the sixteenth century, and which has been preserved even by Löhe: "Thus writes (St. Paul to the Romans in the thirteenth chapter, verses 11-14." "This Holy Gospel writes (St. Matthew in twenty-first chapter, verses 1-9)." Seldom do we find the rubrics at this place in the old Liturgies *fuller* than this. Often do we find them *simpler*, and sometimes they simply direct at the proper place the reading of the Epistle and the Gospel, without any specified form of announcement. Who will *pretend* that such rubrics are justified by "the common consent"? Verily our fathers, just emerging from a thousand years of papal darkness and subservience to times and seasons, were less inclined to *ἡμέραλατρία* than are some of their sons. The procedure at this point is so manifestly against Lutheran usage as to suggest the thought of impurity.

(b.) Many of the liturgies of the sixteenth century place a Hallelujah, a Gradual or a Sequence between the Epistle and the Gospel. We judge with Kliefoth that the majority provide simply a Psalm or Hymn at this place as an alternative part. We give the usage of some of the very noted ones. The Mecklenburg (1554) orders a sequence or a hymn, as the time may require. The Pomeranian (1568) orders a Tractus, a Hallelujah with Gradual. On Sunday, simply a German Psalm. The great Brandenburg-Nuremberg, in its regular Communion Service, orders either a Hallelujah or a Gradual. In its service where there is no communion, it orders a Hymn. The Saxon (1539) orders a Sequence, or a Psalm, or a Hymn. Calenberg (1542), simply a Hallelujah or a Sequence. It is certainly the exception for a rubric to say, with the COMMON SERVICE: "*A Psalm or Hymn may be sung after the Hallelujah.*"

Of the Psalm or Hymn which occurs in this place, Kliefoth says: "These are only the expansion of the Hallelujah, and should express the gratitude with which the congregation receives the word of the Lord. They are only the rejected *Deo Gratias* and *Gloria Tibi*, with which, according to ancient usage, the congregation responded to the reading of the Gospel and

Epistle," p. 157. It is the uniform and almost invariable custom of the Lutheran Liturgies to proceed *at once*, after the simplest form of announcement, to the reading of the Gospel, and from that to the Creed. That is, as Kliefoth says, they have abandoned the "Glory be to thee, O Lord," and the "Praise be to thee, O Christ," which are found both in Löhe and in the COMMON SERVICE. The one solitary exception which we have found, is the Pomeranian (1568), which uses only "Ehre sei Dir, Herre," and which is so *exceptional*, that Kliefoth notes it with the remark: *Die Pommersche geht ganz auf die alte sitte zurück.* The *alte sitte* is that of the Missal of the Middle Ages, which has *Gloria tibi, Domine*, and *Laus tibi, Christe*. In his first edition, Löhe used a Hallelujah at the close of the Gospel Lesson, but he tells us in his second edition (p. 35, n.) "*das ist falsch.*" Then he gives "*Lob sei Dir, O Christe*—really old, as the Roman Liturgy shows." Whether the COMMON SERVICE "goes wholly back to the ancient custom," or whether it simply reproduces Löhe in these versicles, we do not know; but it is certain beyond question that the judgment and liturgical taste of the fathers of the sixteenth century, rejected them with a unanimity which is almost *absolute*.*

(e.) *The Offertory.* It will not be pretended that "the common consent" of the Lutheran Liturgies of the sixteenth century, furnishes an *Offertory*. We have found it in only one—the Mark Brandenburg (1540), which is uniformly denominated *Romanizing*. So entirely foreign is it to the recognized liturgism of the Lutheran Church, that Kliefoth does not even mention it in discussing the parts of this section. Harnack says in his Liturgical Tables: "Statt des Offertorius ein Lied oder Psalm." Caspar Calvör, who, as Buddeus observes, "has well represented the rites of our Church" (Isagoge p. 929), says: "In the Churches

*We were informed by the member of the Common Service Committee alluded to above, that we could find these versicles, or responses in Spangenberg. *We do not find them there.* Neither do they appear in the Harrisburg Report, nor is there anything to indicate that they should appear in "finishing the details;" and the scholar, acquainted with the Lutheran liturgies, would say that they could not appear in the finished work, under the rule of "the common consent."

of the Protestants, Psalmody has been restored to the place of the Offertory. As soon as the preacher has descended from the pulpit, the congregation begins to sing a Psalm which has reference either to the Sermon or to repentance or to the Holy Supper. QUOD CONVENIENTIUS." Of course Löhe has the Offertory. In the Preface to his second edition he declares that he hates the Romish Offertory, and says that he does not intend to employ it as in the Mass-offering, but "as the churchly utterance accompanying the churchly alms-giving of the congregation." "There lies in this a great moral demand that one should learn to regard his giving as a sacrifice, to give as if offering a sacrifice (opfernd). At the same time I willingly confess that in this form of the Offertory I see no completion (Vollendung), but I hold the presental of the *primitiae creaturarum*, i. e. the praying presental of the elements, that the Lord may unite with them his holy body and his precious blood as the crowning point (Höhenpunkt) of the Offertory and as much more churchly, liturgical, more beautiful, than if we simply have the elements placed upon the altar by the sexton." (See Preface). It is not difficult to see how easy it would be to pass from Löhe's conception of the Offertory to that which prevails in the Roman Catholic Church. In the first place, he thinks that we ought to present our gifts as if offering a sacrifice. In the second place, his idea is that the elements should be presented with prayer in order that the Lord may unite with them his holy body. We regard this as only one step from that priestly consecration which is supposed to transubstantiate the elements into the body and blood of Christ. The Offertory of Löhe and that of the COMMON SERVICE are in the same place, and are given in almost the same words, and are intended to be used every Lord's day, and for the same purpose, namely, as "the churchly utterance accompanying the churchly alms-giving of the congregation."

Now, whatever may have been the mind of those who constructed the COMMON SERVICE, we cannot refrain from lifting up one weak voice against the Offertory. We object to the word itself, just as we object to the word *Priest*, which almost everywhere in the KOO. of the sixteenth century, is used for minister; as we object to the word *Mass* for Lord's Supper, which

likewise is used in the same documents; as we object to the word *Absolution* for the ministerial declaration of grace. There is something in a name when for ages that name has been bound up in the popular mind with superstitions, and with grievous, soul-destroying, Christ-obscuring error. All things may be lawful, but all things are not expedient, and all things edify not. We object to the thing itself. Whilst we heartily endorse the idea of "worshiping God with our substance," with equal heartiness do we protest against the idea of giving "as if offering a sacrifice;" and we can hardly separate the two ideas when we sing, "The sacrifices of God," etc., every time we drop a penny or a nickel in the collection basket. With the constant and ever growing tendency to magnify the importance of our gifts and benefactions, we cannot but believe that evil is portended in the Offertory. Wisely did our fathers omit it from their services, and most unwisely do we restore it to our ecclesiastical vocabulary, and to usage in our congregations.* In spite of anything and everything we may do to the contrary, people will still associate with our use of the word the definitions of the encyclopedias and dictionaries: "An anthem chanted or a voluntary played on the organ during the offering and first part of the Mass. That part of the Mass in which the priest prepares the elements for consecration."—Webster. Why should we take upon ourselves the necessity of having to make constant explanations? Why should we erect a stumbling block? Even the Church of England has been more cautious in her Offertory, which may consist of one or more of a large number of appropriate verses of Scripture, which are read by the minister while the offerings of the people are being gathered; but only one of them speaks of sacrifices.

3. The third section of the Service consists of the Creed, the Nicene Creed, the Sermon, the Hymn, (Predigtlied). "With few

*The Liturgy of the Buffalonians, founded on the old Pomeranian, has no Offertory. The same is true of the German Liturgy of the Missourians, founded on the old Saxon. The English Liturgy of the Missourians has an Offertory only in connection with the Communion. It is composed of vers. 10, 11, 12, of 51st Psalm, and has no reference whatever to giving or sacrificing.

exceptions the Confession of Faith remains between the Gospel and the Sermon, and has the following signification: The Gospel of the day is only a single part (*einzelheit*) of the entire Gospel. This part the Sermon is to explain, and the people are to apprehend. But only this special part of the faith is explained, and only according to the analogy of the faith. For this reason, the congregation, between the word of God for the day and the explanations thereof, briefly recalls the entire summary of the faith. The necessary consequence then is that both the preacher who explains, and the congregation which apprehends, must repeat the summary of the faith."*

"When the preacher descends from the pulpit he intones the *Predigtlied*, and the congregation sings it through. Very many KOO, about a third of those *vom ächten Typus*, do not have the *Predigtlied*, but begin the Communion-act immediately after the Sermon. These wish to indicate sharply that the two halves of the Divine Service are only inseparable parts of one whole."† Kliefoth declares that only a few (*einige wenige*) place a versicle after the Sermon. In our own search through a great many liturgies we have found the *Da pacem*, Gott gieb Friede, or Verleih uns Frieden gnädiglich, only a very few times. This gives *small authority* indeed for the *Votum*‡ after the sermon. Kliefoth continues: "In the true mean stand the most of the KOO., which by means of the *Predigtlied* give to the act of the word, a closing, but not such an one as harmonizes with the closing of the entire service. In regard to the selection of this hymn all the KOO. are agreed that it must suit the Sermon, and not be already a communion hymn." The Mecklenburg closes the non-Communion Service here with the Litany, or a Psalm, or a Hymn and the Benediction. The Pomeranian: Litany, or a

*Kliefoth, p. 161.

†Kliefoth, p. 162.

‡In the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY for 1885, p. 313, the reader will find a translation of "Löhe's Liturgical Table." We have this table in a form *minutely* corrected and supplemented by the late Dr. B. M. Schumcker. But not in a *solitary instance*, does the word "Votum" appear either printed or written after the Sermon. The reader will also learn from this table something about the "General Prayer," viz., that "the common consent" does not place a general prayer after the Sermon.

Psalm, Collect and Benediction. The Brandenburg-Nuremberg: Hymn (Lobgesang) Collects, or General Prayer. *Benedicamus*, Benediction. Palatinate: Just like the Mecklenburg, from which it was taken. So in general, others.

4. The fourth section comprises the remainder, that is, the Communion proper. This consists of two parts.

(1.) The Salutation, the Preface, the Sanctus, the Admonition to the communicants. The Salutation,—“The Lord be with you.” “And with thy spirit,”—belongs to the Preface, and is placed before it. Hence when the Preface is omitted, as is very generally the case in the South German KOO., the Salutation also is omitted. Even in very many KOO. of the rigid and fuller type, a rubric orders the omission of the Preface when the time is short. The Pomeranian directs that the Preface may be said by the Priest on festal days, if the time will allow. So likewise the Wittenberg (1533), but also that it may be omitted at pleasure. The Saxon (1539) allows it on festal days or sometimes on Sunday. The Lüneburg directs that the Preface may be sung on festal days, if time permit. By means of the Preface the Priest aims to bring out the prayers of the congregation, and to begin the preparation of the heart for the celebration of the great mystery of the Holy Sacrament. Calvör, p. 566.

It is no unusual thing also for a rubric to direct the omission of the Exhortation. In a word, the KOO. are exceedingly flexible at this point of the service. The Mecklenburg, which ranks as one of the fullest, and which perhaps more than any other, after the Brandenburg-Nuremberg, shaped, through Löhe, the COMMON SERVICE, says: “If there be time (so man Zeit hat), the Priest may read an Exhortation. After the Exhortation, or when because of the shortness of the time, the Exhortation and Preface have been omitted, immediately after the Sermon the Priest may sing the Lord’s Prayer and the words of the Testament,” that is, the words of Institution. The Saxon allows the omission of the Exhortation on festal days, and the substitution for it of a Latin Preface.

(2.) The second section of the Communion Act consists of the Lord’s Prayer, the Words of Institution, the Distribution while singing *Agnus Dei* and other hymns. Here the KOO.

fall into three groups. "The first group represents those few KOO. which place the Lord's Prayer in the first section. These have in this place no Lord's Prayer, but allow the preacher to say the Words of Institution, and to distribute the Sacrament while the congregation sings. The second group, about one fourth of the entire number, represents those KOO. which begin this section with the Words of Institution, consequently with the consecration, and follow with the Lord's Prayer. These are they which employ here still additional Liturgical parts, among which is the Sanctus, which, in consequence of what precedes they omit in the Preface. The fundamental type of this group is the following: The preacher begins with the singing of the Words of Institution. The choir responds with the Sanctus. Then the preacher sings the Lord's Prayer, and the congregation responds, Amen! Then the preacher intones the *Pax Domini sit vobiscum*, and the choir responds either with another Amen, or with *Et cum Spiritu tuo*. Finally, the Choir begins the Agnus Dei, and the preacher begins the distribution, during which the Choir and the congregation, after the Agnus Dei is finished, sing either together or responsively a Communion Hymn, until the distribution is completed. Within this group are the following variations: Along with the Sanctus the Benedictus is also sung; or, 'Es wolle Gott uns gnädig sein' instead of the Sanctus; or the Sanctus is entirely omitted, because already it has found a place in the Preface. Some KOO. also add an opening or closing prayer to the Lord's Prayer. The Pax is sometimes, though seldom, omitted. It is even also placed after the Agnus. The Agnus is also said by the preacher before the Distribution, kneeling. Between the Agnus or Pax and the Distribution, some few place, in addition, the Exhortation to the communicants and intercessions for the same. This is done naturally by those which provide no special division for the Preparation, and hence bring together the former sacrificial with the second sacramental section. On the contrary three-fourths of the KOO. form the third group according to our scheme. They order the preacher to begin with the Lord's Prayer, to to which the congregation responds, Amen. Then the Minister sings the Words of Institution, and the Distribution begins,

while the Choir sings, after the shorter Agnus, 'Isaiah the Prophet,' 'Jesus Christ, unser Heiland,' 'Gott sei gelobet und gebenedeiet, according as the number of communicants is large or small; until at the close the whole congregation falls in with the longer German Agnus. Only one of these KOO. orders a *Pax* between the Words of Institution and the Distribution." (Kliefoth, p. 167). It thus appears that three-fourths of the Lutheran Liturgies *von dem ächten Typus*, do, according to Kliefoth, place the Lord's Prayer *before* the Words of Institution. Löhe places it after the Words of Institution, and thus indulges still further his inclination towards antiquity. The form of the COMMON SERVICE in hand places it before the Words of Institution, as the great majority require. The form of the COMMON SERVICE printed by the General Synod either follows Löhe, or returns with a few KOO. to the older usage (the Greek). But it will be observed that the vote is overwhelmingly against Löhe and the COMMON SERVICE in the use of the *Pax*.

(3.) "After the German *Agnus Dei*, begins the third and last section. By far the greater number of the KOO. have there, according to our scheme, the Versicle, the Thanksgiving-Collect (which is called the Post Communion), the Benediction and the final Hymn. * * * The Versicle is wanting in many Liturgies. In a very few the Salutation, the Versicle, and the Collect are omitted, and the congregation sings instead, *Nun danket Alle Gott*, whereupon follows the Benediction. On the contrary a few others omit the Benediction, and instruct the congregation to sing *Es wolle Gott uns gnädig sein*. It seldom happens that this whole section consists only of the Benediction and the final Hymn. A few more have yet between the Collect and the Benediction, the *Benedicamus*, that is, the minister intones *Benedicamus Domino*, and the Choir responds *Deo dicamus Grätias*." (Kliefoth, pp. 168-9). But the *Benedicamus* is found in Löhe, in the COMMON SERVICE and in the Roman Mass. It must be distinctly understood that it is found only in a few KOO., and that even some of these omit other parts generally included in this section. Löhe, the COMMON SERVICE and the Calvinistic lit-

urgies also include in this section the *Nunc Dimittis*.* But the KOO. are against it with the most overwhelming majority. Kliefoth does not even mention it as normal to this section. Löhe (p. 53) says: "The *Nunc Dimittis* stands in this place in the oldest liturgies of the Lutheran Church, (Bugenhagan 1552, Döber 1525, Strassburg 1525)." But what are these, two of them personal orders, and one that of a city which had not yet accepted the Lutheran doctrine in full, and all quickly supplanted,—what are these three against scores? Even Löhe himself, after giving the form for this part of the Mass in widest use in the Lutheran Church, and after naming more than a score of the great Liturgies belonging to the sixteenth, the seventeenth, and the eighteenth centuries, declares that they celebrate this part of the service without the *Nunc Dimittis* (p. 60). That Löhe, in accordance with his expressed determination "to go back to the old, yea to the very old," should restore the *Nunc Dimittis* is not strange; but that it should appear in the COMMON SERVICE, constructed under the rule: "The common consent of the pure Lutheran Liturgies of the sixteenth century," is passing strange indeed. Perhaps it went a *Calvinizing* at this point?

v.

In the foregoing section (iv.) of our paper we have made a tolerably close analysis of the Lutheran Ordnung der Messe oder Hauptgottesdienst, or Communion Service, and have shown the variations and additions of Löhe and the COMMON SERVICE. We have followed Kliefoth and have given him as authority at every point,—this, not because we have not ourselves carefully surveyed almost the entire field in the originals, but that we might give the reader the benefit of the judgment and the conclusions of this great liturgical scholar. But we would not do justice either to Kliefoth or to the reader, did we not also present in this connection Kliefoth's own exhibition of the normal type, or the average usage of the Liturgies which he has just been discussing so thoroughly. He says: "It will now be easy to present the Lutheran type in the construction of the Communion Service

*It is proper to repeat here that the Common Service published by the General Synod omits both the *Benedicamus* and the *Nunc Dimittis*.

(*Hauptgottesdienst*). As an aid to the sight, Appendix III. gives an exhibition of the Christmas Communion Service (*Weihnachts-Hauptgottesdienst*), as it is contained in the revised Mecklenburg KO. of 1602.* The representative type dare therefore rightly be taken from the Mecklenburg KO., because this, as it regards the expansion or contraction of the Lutheran forms, holds a middle ground among the KOO. of the rigid (*streng*) type, so that with it both the additions and the omissions of other KOO. can most easily be brought into view. If any one will compare the form of Divine Service in Appendix III. with the copies of the KO. named, he will find that that (form) corresponds with these (copies)." The Appendix is as follows: (We condense slightly, but indicate absolutely every part).

- 1 "Choir: "To us a child is born," (brief hymn).
- 2 Gloria Patri.
- 3 Kyrie.
4. Gloria in Excelsis.
5. Salutation.
6. Collect (very brief).
7. Epistle.
8. Hymn.
9. Gospel.
10. Creed. "Wir glauben all an Einen Gott."
11. Sermon with General Prayer.
12. Hymn, "Ein Kindlein so lobelich."

-
13. Salutation.
 14. Sursum Corda.
 15. Preface.
 16. Exhortation to the Communicants.
 17. Lord's Prayer.
 18. Words of Institution.

*Of course this does not belong to the sixteenth century, but then it is in the great era of dogmatic Lutheranism, and none of the great liturgical writers draw a sharp line at the close of the sixteenth century.

19. Communion while the Choir and congregation sing communion hymns.

20. Thanksgiving Collect.

21. Benediction.

22. Doxology.

The reader will be impressed with the simplicity and *comparative* brevity of this service, which, Kliefoth says, holds the middle ground of the *more rigid type* of the Lutheran Liturgies. There are a few which exceed this in fullness; there are *many* which fall behind it in fullness and in the number of their parts. It is just what Kliefoth designs it to be, viz., a representation of the Lutheran type of the Communion Service as exhibited in the liturgies of the rigid (*streng*) and fuller form, viz., those of Northern and Central Germany. In accordance with what might be expected from the facts found in the preceding section of this paper, it entirely omits the *Confiteor*. For the *Introit de dominica* (Lord's day) or *de tempore*, it substitutes a hymn, as do very many of the KOO. A Simple Hymn takes the place of the more formal Hallelujah. There are no Salutations connected with the reading of the Gospel, no Offertory, no *Benedicamus*, no *Nunc Dimittis*. The wide difference between Kliefoth's Hauptgottesdienst, drawn from "*the common consent*" of the *rigid type* of Lutheran Liturgies, and the Hauptgottesdienst of Löhe and the COMMON SERVICE, is at once apparent. But then Löhe does not *pretend* to give a consensus. On the contrary he expressly states already in his first preface: "No old Liturgy would have presented the fullness which this presents. I sought to combine in it whatever from about two hundred old Liturgies seemed to me best." A learned liturgical author of the German Iowa Synod, who writes, "I have all the Lutheran Kirchenordnungen," and, "I have seen Löhe's library," says: "Löhe's Liturgy is not a mere compilation. He takes whatever is good, and now and then he goes to the old Roman and Greek liturgies, or even to the Book of Common Prayer, as he frankly owns. In fullness of parts he exceeds the (Consensus I dare not say, for there was none*) Lutheran Liturgies and Kirchenordnungen of

*Our own studies in Liturgies have led us to the same conclusion ex-

the sixteenth century." But the Common Service *does* claim to exhibit "The common consent of the pure Lutheran Liturgies of the sixteenth century." Yet the foregoing discussion and the subjoined table show *conclusively* that *part for part* and *form for form*, Löhe's Liturgy and the COMMON SERVICE are ALMOST IDENTICAL, so nearly identical that the liturgical scholar would say at

actly as that expressed by our learned Iowa correspondent, from whose letter we quote by written permission, viz., that there was no such thing as *Consensus* among the Lutheran Liturgies of Germany in the sixteenth century. We add by permission the following from a learned Professor in the St. Louis Seminary: "In the first place I have to say in general, that in the Lutheran Church, with reference to Liturgy, there is no such thing as *Consensus*. *Consensus* is demanded only in reference to doctrine. Luther did not enjoin it, nor did he set up a uniform Liturgy for the whole Lutheran Church. In all unity of the Spirit, each country, yea, almost every city, had its own Order. See Luther's Preface to German Mass, Erlangen Ed. 22, p. 227; Augs. Con., Art. 7; Form of Concord, Art. X." Backed by these judgments and by the numerous great *Ordnungen* lying before us, we do not hesitate to declare: "The common consent of the pure Lutheran liturgies of the sixteenth century," is a *pure* American figment. The liturgical practice of the Lutheran Church in Germany in the sixteenth century, exhibits the greatest variety, and every country and town was not only accorded the right of ordering, but was expected to order, its own service. The services adapted to the real or supposed wants of each locality, generally contained the same leading or principal parts, as the Introit or Psalm, the Kyrie, the Collect, the Epistle, the Gospel, the Sermon, etc., but the arrangement was often different, and some omitted this, and others omitted that, some added this, and others added that, as is clearly seen in section IV. of this paper and in the table appended. Now "the common consent" would require that only those parts should be taken which are *common* to these liturgies, for that is the only rational and allowable meaning of the phrase in theological terminology, and it is the only way in which the phrase would be tolerated in symbolics. It can scarcely be doubted that this is the only way that the bodies which adopted the rule of "the common consent." understood it should be used in the construction of the COMMON SERVICE. And that this interpretation of the rule is clearly within the rule itself, is certain from the modifying clause: "When there is not entire agreement among them (the pure liturgies), the consent of the largest number of those of greatest weight." The first thing to be sought was "entire agreement." If this could not be found, then there must be the "consent of the largest number of those of greatest weight." "Entire agreement" can

once that the former is without the shadow of doubt or question the presupposition of the latter. An examiner, not a liturgical scholar, but acquainted with the language of each, would say: The latter is, in *almost all* essential parts, a *translation* of the former. A person acquainted with the Lutheran Liturgies of the sixteenth century, on examining and comparing, would say

only mean agreement in every part. Now, applied in this way—we believe the only rational and proper way—the result would be a very simple liturgy, as may be seen from an examination of columns five, six, seven, and eight, in the table below, for these will enable us to determine fairly well “the common consent,” and will exhibit somewhat minutely “the consent of the largest number of those of greatest weight.” And that the rule was sometimes applied in this more restricted sense, is shown by the non-concurrence of the Committee of the General Council in the preference of the General Synod’s Committee for scripture passages to be used at the option of the minister instead of the Declaration or Absolution after the Confession of Sins, and in the position of the Lord’s Prayer after the Words of Institution: “To these variations your Committee could not give their assent, since they were, in their judgment, not sanctioned by the common consent of the pure Lutheran Liturgies.”—Minutes, 1887, p. 24. Yet about one-fourth, according to Kliefoth, including the influential Brandenburg-Nuremberg, do place the Lord’s Prayer after the Words of Institution. Had the rule been applied in every instance in this restricted sense, the result would have been materially different.

But let the rule be allowed to extend to a mean between the extremes (see discussion in connection with the table), then it will give about such a liturgy as that furnished on a preceding page by Kliefoth. Or allow it to be carried even to the extreme of fullness,—which would be an unheard-of application of the phrase—then it could not go beyond the Mecklenburg (column seven of table) and yet remain within the bounds of the “standard” Lutheran liturgies, or “of those of the greatest weight.” But if in reply to all this it be said: The difference between the extreme of fullness, or the average, on the one side, and the COMMON SERVICE on the other, is not very great, then we reply, Not very great is the *number of words*, but great in the *shaping* and in the *character* which it imparts to the service, for this difference furnishes just those parts and features which, in the main, have given offence, which the people have stumbled at, which in some congregations have caused trouble, which have had to be modified in order that the COMMON SERVICE might be retained in some form, and which, we have been positively assured, were *disliked* and *opposed* by some members of the COMMON SERVICE Committee.

emphatically, that *neither* fairly represents "the Lutheran type in the construction of the Communion Service," but both are *Luthero-Romanizing*, in that, as Daniel says of the Mark Brandenburg (1540), while they hold fast the Lutheran doctrine, in regard to ceremonies they seem to stand "in *vestigiis Pontificionum*."* Such was the judgment pronounced upon Löhe's Liturgy by German critics forty years ago; such is the opinion held of it to-day by the Missourians, as we are informed by private letter (which we are permitted to use) from one of the learned professors in the (St. Louis) Concordia Seminary.

But was it merely *accidental* that these two services departed from the Lutheran Liturgies in almost every instance at exactly the same place, and in almost every instance of departure, used almost the same identical parts? Was this the result of accident? *Credat Judaens Apella non ego*. We know that the Chairman of the Joint Committee on COMMON SERVICE was considerably influenced by Löhe in the preparation of the Pennsylvania Synod's Liturgy of 1860, for he translated and adopted that portion of Löhe's Preface which contains his central liturgical principle (see below). He has also tacitly acknowledged Löhe's influence in the preparation of the Church-Book of 1868.†

We know also that the same person declared before the General Council in Philadelphia, Oct. 8th, 1885: "For the General Council the acceptance of the Common English Service proposed presents no serious difficulties. Our church books were prepared under the operation of the same rule which controlled

*After careful examination we give it as our deliberate opinion that, taken all in all, both Löhe and the Common Service are more *prolix* than the Mark Brandenburg. That they are altogether more *prolix* up to the place of the communion than the *non-communion* service of that order, we are quite certain. It was with the "prolixity" of the Mark Brandenburg that Luther found fault. See Table.

†In the *Lutheran Quarterly* for April, 1885, there is an article in which it is stated that "Löhe's Agende is, both as regards its parts and arrangement nearly identical with the Romish Mass," and "that the service of the General Council's Church Book, in its parts is nearly identical with that of Löhe's Agende, and in its arrangement there is very little variation between them." In the *Lutheran* of May, 14, 1885, Dr. Schmucker elaborately reviews the article, but takes no exception to these statements.

in this. The result in both cases must necessarily be substantially the same. Indeed, no changes of any serious or noticeable character would be made in our Church Book, except such as have already been approved by the Council, in its action on the German Church Book," (*Minutes*, p. 13). Moreover we have been very positively informed by one who has a right to know, that the greatest deference was paid to Löhe by the Committee. The reader is simply asked to bear these facts in mind when he comes to examine the table below. But it is important that the reader should be informed in regard to the central principle which guided Löhe in the construction of his Liturgy. We find it in the Preface to his second edition: "In the first preface I compared the entire order of service to a mountain with two peaks, and understood these two peaks to be the Sermon and the Lord's Supper as prominent points of the service. Although now I said at that time already that one peak was higher than the other, that for the liturgy the Holy Supper occupies the higher place, I would now, if I had to give another interpretation, assign to the Holy Supper a still higher place. For the liturgy of the morning service the Holy Supper remains the direct goal towards which all the single parts of the service point and move as towards the centre. As there can be no Lutheran Church edifice, as all plans and structures must prove abortive so long as one does not admit that the *altar* rules the whole system; thus there is no Lutheran Liturgy so long as one does not recognize in the Holy Supper the sum total of all that is liturgical, and the perfected summit of all the life of public worship.

"All the labor that has been expended in the second edition of this liturgy, upon the morning service, is thoroughly pervaded by this way of thinking. The act of distribution is carefully elaborated. Perhaps just here is nevertheless the most tender point of the first part. Perhaps this development of the distribution will be found too purposeful, too much flavored with the confessional controversial spirit of the age. But I was perfectly calm, and it seemed to me as if my work was yielding nothing but a faithful expression of truth, adapted indeed to the times, yet very old."

This is strange doctrine to fall from a Lutheran pen. No-

where have we seen its like on a Lutheran page. From beginning to end it savors of the Romish mass, and departs *toto coelo* from the doctrine of the Reformation era. Luther, who cannot be accused of slighting either the service of the altar or the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, would have crushed it to atoms by one fell blow of the mighty sledge-hammer of his anti-papistic denunciation. He would have shouted against it with the emphasis of the thunder's peal: "Alles Gottesdienstes das grössest und fürnehmpest Stück ist Gottes Wort predigen und lehren." It was by the pulpit, not by the altar; it was by preaching, not by saying masses, that Luther wrought the Reformation. It was of his sermons, not of his liturgies, that his contemporaries said: "Non verba, sed tonitrua!" "Preaching was the centre and spring of his power; by preaching he moved Germany and then Europe, till he shook the papal throne."* It was as preachers primarily and chiefly that Bugenhagen, Brentz, Veit Dietrich, Osiander *et al.* served the cause of Christ in the sixteenth century. And it is because of preaching that the Lutheran Church has ever held that the Word of God is the chief means of grace. Hence it sounds strange to hear Löhe say that the fathers of the Reformation "gave altogether too much room to the sermon," (see *Preface*). And again: "Every Sunday and festival-day service without the celebration of the Lord's Supper is like a column with a piece broken off; and if it has to be thus abbreviated without attaining to its highest goal because of the absence of communicants, this is a sad and a suspicious sign as to the condition of the congregation," (p. 64).

These are the principles, utterly un-Lutheran, that is, if Luther is a Lutheran, according to which Löhe constructed his Liturgy. Taken all in all, they advance so far towards Rome that we are not surprised that a German Lutheran theologian of soundest orthodoxy should write: "Löhe's Romanizing tendency showed itself already in his liturgical labors, and brought him to a plan for visitation of the sick *with anointing*."† In the *Correspondenzblatt*, December, 1857, Löhe published the plan of

*Ker., *History of Preaching*, p. 149.

†Private Letter, from which we are permitted to quote.

a liturgy for so-called "apostolical visitation of the sick" with anointing. A distinguished lady who was afflicted with an almost incurable malady, desired on her sick-bed to be treated in accordance with James 5 : 14 et seq. The anointing is to be performed with the following words: "*In obedience to the holy command, I anoint thee herewith in the name of the Lord, of the Father†, of the Son†, of the Holy Ghost†. To him, the Triune God, be thanks and honor. But to thee come healing and peace if it be his holy will.*" In the year 1860 Löhe issued "*Rosenmonate heiliger Frauen*," which he wished to be read as morning lessons by female readers. In the same are also repeated the papal legends (Luther: *Lügenden*) of the saints; celibacy is designated as a "betrothal to God," as a holy work, etc., etc. Equally un-Lutheran is he in regard to the ministry: In *Aphorismus* he writes: "The office stands in the midst of the congregations like a fruitful tree which has its seed *in itself*; it *completes itself*. As long as the examination and ordination remain in the possession of the Presbytery, it is right, and can be maintained, that it complete and perpetuate itself, from person to person, from generation to generation. *Those who have it*, bestow it further, and he to whom it shall be further delivered by the possessor, has it also by divine sanction. The office is a stream of blessing which pours itself from the apostles upon their disciples, and from the disciples further, and so on down the ages," (p. 71) He also denied to congregations the right to choose their pastors. In "*Aphorismus*" he writes: "*The last judgment and the final decision* concerning the person to be chosen must be determined by him who has the commission, (the pastor). The work was always *his*, and to *his* love, wisdom and responsibility, *was committed* the measure in which the choice of the congregation takes place," (p. 58). "An unconditional right of suffrage of the congregation is not only unapostolic but in the highest degree dangerous," (p. 59).

Such are the principles, liturgical, doctrinal and practical, of the man whose Liturgy is commended to us through the COMMON SERVICE. The reader who has intelligent interest enough to carry him to this point in the discussion has intelligent judgment enough to make his own comments.

But perhaps it may be profitable to learn just what favor Löhe's Liturgy met with, and the chief end he had in view in publishing a second edition. These are the opening words of the Preface: "Although this liturgy was received with general favor, yet scarcely a congregation, so far as known to the publisher, has adopted it for its own, in its original form. Practical use has been made of the book; often and more than is apparent they have gained instruction and advice from it—and the author is so completely satisfied with this blessing, that he has labored in the second edition with the special object in view to make his book more than ever properly adapted for the use above indicated. He wished that it might become a *manual* and *text-book* for such pastors as are inexperienced in liturgical affairs, and desire information on the subject. Hence the introductions to the separate parts; hence the completeness and fullness which made it desirable to issue the book in two parts; and hence the observations, and quotations of authorities. Although the publisher kept this his main design in view, yet he believes, nevertheless, that his book can be *actually used* in the congregations and their public worship just as it is, if they wish to. It presupposes in this case only what every book presupposes in those who use it, that one is intimately acquainted with its drift and contents." The book does indeed contain much valuable information, but to what extent it is used either in Germany or in America we know not. Prof. Lutz, who prepared the Hand-Agende for the Iowa Synod, writes that in so doing he followed Deinzer's edition of Löhe.

VI.

It remains to make yet another comparison. An examination of the table will show how closely both Löhe and the COMMON SERVICE (as compared with the Brandenburg-Nuremberg, the Mecklenburg and the Saxon) follow the Mediaeval Mass. The Preface to the COMMON SERVICE tells us: "There is an extremely close agreement between this first Prayer Book (Edward VI.* 1549) and the COMMON SERVICE. * * And should that Church (the Church of England) and her daughters return to

*Son and successor of Henry VIII. of England.

the use of the Book of Edward VI., as many of her most learned and devout members have ever wished, there would be an almost entire harmony in the services of worship between the two daughters of the Reformation, who both have purified and then preserved the services of the Christian Church of the olden times."

The reader may be interested in ascertaining something about the history of the Book of Edward VI. The Protestant model adopted by Archbishop Cranmer and his co-commissioners was the Cologne Reformation, which appeared in an English translation in the year 1548. But this, in so far as it was used, was variously modified, rearranged and adapted; or as Archbishop Lawrence says: "Liberally imitating but not entirely copying."—(*Bampton Lectures*, p. 377). Or as Hardwick says: "Our own Liturgy is derived almost entirely from the ancient and mediæval Liturgies, and in no inconsiderable degree through the medium of a Lutheran compilation."—(*Hist. Arts.*, p. 80). But it must be understood that this "Lutheran compilation" influenced the English Book relatively more in the occasional offices, than in the Sunday service. Hence Burbidge, an ardent Church-of-England man, says truthfully: "The Service of 1549 was the old Roman Liturgy revised."* At first the new book was generally accepted throughout the kingdom. But in the course of a few months objections began to arise, now from one quarter and now from another. Hence Burbidge says: "So that whilst the new Book of Common Prayer was publicly commended to the people as ordaining 'that nothing be read but the very pure Word of God, or what is evidently grounded upon the same,' a spirit of opposition to its instructions was being generally fostered."† Bishop Hooper preached against it before the King: "Great shame it is for a noble king, emperor, or magistrate, contrary unto God's word to detain and keep from the devil or his minister any of their good or treasure, as the candles, vestments, crosses, altars. For if they be kept in the church as things indifferent, at length they will be maintained as things necessary."‡ He also urged the King to change it. Finally

* *Liturgies of the Church*, p. 172.

† *Liturgies of the Church*, p. 163.

‡ *Works*, pp. 536, 554.

the King himself declared that he would have the Prayer-Book changed on his own authority.* Cranmer also soon came to see that alteration would have to be made, and so he sent a Latin translation to Martin Bucer, whom the Preface to the COMMON SERVICE calls a *Lutheran Professor*, and sought his judgment thereon. Blunt says with evident rage: "Bucer was perhaps the most violent of all apponents of the Prayer Book, publishing a 'Censure' of it in twenty-eight chapters just before his death in 1551, in which he condemns all ceremonies and customs derived from the ancient Services of the Church of England, from the Consecration of the Holy Eucharist to the ringing of church bells, of which with the want of imagination and musical ear so common among his class of Reformers, he had a great abhorrence"†—a statement manifestly too strong and revealing Blunt's well-known extreme High Church and Romanizing predilections. But it is true, Bucer, a Lutheran Professor, who even in England maintained pure Lutheran doctrine, did condemn many things as savoring too much of the service from which in so large part it had been taken, viz., the Romish Mass; and Bishop Burnet tells us that "almost in every particular the most material things which Bucer excepted to were corrected afterwards."‡ Burnet himself says of Edward's Book: "Several things had been continued in it, either to draw in some of the bishops, who by such yielding might be prevailed on to concur in it; or in compliance with the people, who were fond of their old superstitions."§ The history of the case shows conclusively that the book was not sufficiently *purified*, was not sufficiently *protestant*, for the evangelical sentiment of the Church of England at that time, albeit she had not advanced very far, neither has she yet advanced very far beyond the limits of the Papacy; and Burbidge is of the opinion "that the alterations were the independent work of the commissioners themselves, and were not the result of consultation with foreign divines," and yet he concedes the correctness of Burnet's remark about Bucer; nor are

*Styke's *Cranmer*, II. 663.

†Annot. Bk. Com. Pr. p. 20.

‡Hist. Ref. Vol. I. p. 405 Bohn's edition.

§Hist. Ref. Vol. I. p. 404, Bohn's edition.

the two statements in opposition to each other. At all events the book was changed, and Burbidge says that the changes were so great that it is hardly possible to compare together the two Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552, and that the objections to the later book "are founded for the most part upon the supposition that the Roman Liturgy was the only orthodox guide which our reformers could use, and consequently that its principal features ought to have been maintained at all costs."* These statements, taken wholly from English sources, will convey to the reader a pretty clear idea of the Book of Edward VI., between which and the COMMON SERVICE the Preface declares "there is an extremely close agreement." We can assure the reader from personal examination that in our opinion the English Protestants did not misjudge the book. "The service of 1549 was the old Roman Liturgy revised,"—not much changed, not much protestantized, still closely conformed to the Roman Ritual. But the COMMON SERVICE is in "extremely close agreement" with the English Book.† *Ergo.*

But now in this closing decade of the nineteenth century the English-speaking Lutherans of America are asked to accept and to use a service in "extremely close agreement" with this book which the English rejected three hundred and forty years ago; and they are encouraged to do so on the ground that many of the most learned and devout members of the Church of England—Ward, Pusey, Keble, Blunt, *et al.*, we suppose—have desired to go back to the Book of Edward VI.;—just as though many such have not desired to go back, and as a matter of fact

* *Liturgies of the Church*, p. 172.

† Dr. Shields, whom Dr. Krauth pronounces "one of the most accomplished scholars in the Presbyterian Church," and who is known to be a very earnest advocate of the Book of Common Prayer, says: "The first Prayer-book of King Edward VI., in 1549, had scarcely been issued before it was eagerly assailed by the more evangelical reformers, its relics of papal superstition expunged, and the whole thoroughly reviewed and amended."—(Pres. Bk. Com. Pr., p. 64). Alt classes together the English Liturgy and the Mark Brandenburg of 1540, as those which are closely conformed to the Gregorian Ritual.—(*Christliche Cultus*, p. 160). If by "English Liturgy" he means the Book of Common Prayer, what would he say of the Liturgy of Edward VI.?

have gone back (Manning, Newman *et id omne genus*) to the Church of Rome;—just as though we did not know that even the Book of Common Prayer is generally regarded as one of the chief bridges over which they have accomplished such marvelous feats of tergiversation. Beautiful! beautiful, indeed! and inspired on all sides, no doubt, by the loftiest sentiments of Christian Union. But we surmise that it will be a long time before the "Church of England and her daughters return to the use of the Book of Edward VI., as many of her most learned and devout members have ever wished," and a still longer time before there will "be an almost entire harmony in the services of Worship between the two daughters of the Reformation," the Lutheran Church and the Church of England. But leaving the Book of Edward VI. to slumber peacefully with other Penates of the Church of England, we ask a question: Is there not a possibility that history may repeat itself? Do not like causes produce like effects? Are not like antecedents commonly followed by like consequents? And are not these questions all the more important, when we remember that the wisdom, the *learning*, the *devotional* feeling of our ancestors produced liturgies *not* in "extremely close agreement" with the manifestly and confessedly Romanizing Book of Edward VI.?

But a word yet in reference to the COMMON SERVICE. Compare it with the Roman Ritual; examine it by the light of the verdict so generally passed upon Löhe, with which it is so *nearly identical*; test it by the judgment which the English delivered against the Book of Edward VI., with which it is in "extremely close agreement," and you will discover that it *fully* represents the EXTREMEST form of Liturgy *now* known, or that *ever has been known*, in the Protestant Church. Test it by the Lutheran Liturgies of the sixteenth century, and you will declare that the Church which endorses and adopts it as exhibiting "The common consent of the pure Lutheran Liturgies of the sixteenth century," endorses and adopts a HISTORICAL MISNOMER, and by endorsing and adopting it as its own, places itself on the highest plane of the most *extreme* and *elaborate* Protestant liturgism.*

*The Preface mentions the Brandenburg-Nuremberg, the Wittenberg and the Saxon Visitation Articles (1533) as "Orders of great import-

Nor will it afford much relief to be told in a preface, that congregations may use *just so much* of it as they find profitable. Ecclesiastical bodies are judged by what they formally endorse and promulgate to the world in the body of a book of doctrine or devotion, and not by a qualification which may appear in an obscure preface which is seldom read. Besides, as Bishop Hooper said of the objectionable things in the First Liturgy of Edward VI., between which and the COMMON SERVICE "there is an extremely close agreement,"—"If they be kept in the Church as things indifferent, at length they will be maintained as things necessary," (Works, p. 534),—so it may come to pass among us, that the use of the COMMON SERVICE will be made the *test of loyalty* in the Lutheran Church. Already there have been intimations which point significantly in the direction of such a result.*

ance," and the Saxon (1539), the Mecklenburg, the Lüneburg and Calenberg, as "standard." Will any one undertake to show that the COMMON SERVICE is not more *extreme* and more *elaborate* than any one of these seven?

* The *Lutherisches Kirchenblatt* (Reading-Philadelphia) of July 20, 1889, contains the following: "Dr. Wenner informs us that 'it was resolved by the General Synod to publish the Common Service in all editions of the Book of Worship, just as it was adopted by all the general bodies of the country. For practical reasons the old order of worship is still also printed for the time being (*einstweilen*, provisionally). But the principal point (*Hauptsache*) is, that no Book of Worship is to appear hereafter that does not contain the form of Worship of the sixteenth century, and that this is the form of Worship of the Synod, and also the only legitimate one.'" Inasmuch as the writer was not a member of the late General Synod (neither was Dr. Wenner, he will not undertake to interpret the action of that body. But he nowhere finds it stated in the Minutes that "the old order of service is still printed for practical reasons," that it is to be retained only *einstweilen*, that the COMMON SERVICE is "the form of Worship of the Synod, and also the only legitimate one." These are matters which the next General Synod may be called on to settle. Also sooner or later the General Synod may have to answer this question: Are those congregations which prefer to use the old order of worship, to be held in the disparaged relation implied in Dr. Wenner's interpretation—"for practical reasons,"—and in his statement that the COMMON SERVICE is "the form of Worship of the Synod, and the only legitimate one?" Shall a congregation in the Gen-

Now it is because of the facts recorded in sections IV., V. and VI. of this paper that the writer has not been able to give a *full* and *heartily* indorsement of the COMMON SERVICE. He cannot stand up and tell class after class of theological students, that the COMMON SERVICE "reproduces in English" "the common consent of the pure Lutheran Liturgies of the sixteenth century," when he knows *positively* that such is not the case. He cannot say to his brethren in the ministry, as others have said, Here you have a liturgy which was indorsed by Luther, Melancthon, Bugenhagen, Osiander, Brentz, and other great leaders of the Reformation, when he is certain that they did no such thing; when he knows that Luther objected to such liturgical "prolixity," that Brentz advised against even that degree of fullness exhibited in the Palatinate (1560), and that neither Luther nor Osiander, nor Melancthon, nor Bugenhagen, nor Brentz, ever put his hand to a liturgy, which in elaborateness and compositeness of structure equals the COMMON SERVICE. And to this attitude in relation to the COMMON SERVICE, the writer is brought, not by *hostility* or *indifference* to liturgy, or to liturgical worship, but by zeal for a true, genuine, historical Lutheran liturgy, which shall be adapted to this new ecclesiastical environment. He is conscious of standing on a liturgical plane fully as high as that of

eral Synod be disparaged, proscribed, banned, impeached, for using a mode of worship which the General Synod itself has ordered? These are questions which strike at the very heart of Christian liberty

Moreover, it does not seem to be known, that nearly all the Agenda of the sixteenth century had *two* forms or orders of service. First, there was the fuller and more elaborate form and order for the cities and towns where there were schools, that is, where there was higher intelligence, and ample musical arrangements. Secondly, an abbreviated and simpler service for the villages and the country churches, where it was not possible to execute the more elaborate service. Therefore it is *legitimately* and historically Lutheran to have *two* forms or orders of service in the same book, and to have them exactly on the same level. Hence the General Synod, in restoring the old form of worship, and in putting it on *the very same level with the other*, acted more *Lutheranly* than she at the time knew. Her action was a vindication of the principle of Christian liberty in the matter of rites and ceremonies, and an assertion of the great law of adaptation.

the German Mass, or of the Brandenburg-Nuremberg, or of the Saxon, or of the First Wittenberg of 1533,—“used thereafter by Luther and Bugenhagen,” and by the University of Wittenberg; and of the fact of his having occupied such a position in relation to liturgy for years—in so far as such a fact could manifest itself by *practice*, by *teaching*, and by public avowals,—a Lutheran congregation which he served as pastor, the faculties of two Lutheran colleges, and half a dozen classes of theological students, can bear testimony. But when he teaches those who are hereafter to minister at Lutheran altars, and to preach in Lutheran pulpits, that the pulpit must ever stand *above* the altar, and that preaching is to be their great, their *chief* work in the ministry, he is historically certain that he echoes the sentiment of Spener, Luther, Augustine, Chrysostom, Origen, Paul; yea, he *believes* of the Master himself. And so long as four-fifths of the American people are yet without the pale of the Church, he makes no apology for declaring his conviction that the function of the American pulpit and of the Sunday morning service, is as much the evangelizing of the masses as the edifying of believers.* Such are the views and convictions with which this

*It must be remembered that when the liturgies of the sixteenth century were composed, the ecclesiastical conditions in Germany were very different from what they are in America now. Then the entire population, except the Jews, were members of the Church by virtue of their Baptism, and the majority of them by partaking of the Lord's Supper. Then the chief mission of the Church was the edification of the children of the Church. In America the question is ever coming to the front, How is the Church to gain influence over the great unchurched masses? The chief organ of the most liturgical Protestant Church in America, has recently said: “Let us be brave enough to face the fact that the Church in the United States has no hold and is gaining none, on the city populations.” It is well known that the Episcopal Church, to which reference is here made, has never had any hold on the masses in the country. The organ in question, *The Churchman*, after declaring, “Our so-called parochial system does not reach the masses of the people,” and after deploring “the Church's most lamentable failure in this country,” urges “the General Convention not to let matters of mint, anise and cummin exclude the weightier matter of consulting for the spread of the Gospel.” In the October *Murray's Magazine*, Archdeacon Farrar declared: “If we consider the Parochial System adequate to the needs of these days we are under a complete delusion.” “Func-

paper leaves its author. Should these views and convictions change, either upward or downward, either to the right hand, or to the left hand, the Church shall not be left long in ignorance of the fact.

It remains to add a few paragraphs in explanation of the sub-joined table. The Mediæval Mass is taken, in the main, from the table given in Dr. Shields's "Presbyterian Book of Common Prayer," 1864. It is not given with quite the relative fulness of the other services. The Löhe is taken from the second edition, which differs in no essential respect from the third edition, of 1883. It contains three forms of the *Confiteor*: (a.) Döber (1525); (b.) Wittenberg (1559), Mecklenburg (1552), Wolffgang (1570); (c.) The Austrian (1571). The third edition has the Invocation "In the name of the Father," etc., and only one form of *Confiteor*, that of the Mecklenburg (which occupies the seventh column of our table) with additions. The Church Book of the General Council fills the third column. Part for part, form for form, and word for word, it is *almost* identical with the COMMON SERVICE. Perhaps the only difference that the common person would detect, is that in the place of the Offertory the Church Book instructs the congregation to sing Ps. 51 : 10-12.

tions, and ceremonies, and services may be admirable in their place, but they will never do the work achieved either by Paul, or by Francis of Assisi, or by Wesley and Whitefield. Our Sunday services are delightful to the educated and the faithful; but the unanimous voice of a body of hard-working East-end London clergymen assures us that "Neither in length, nor in structure, nor in language, is our liturgy adapted to the needs of the working-classes. It offers them that which they do not understand, and for which they do not care?" One is tempted to ask, Would the Liturgy of Edward VI. be better adapted to these classes? Farrar proceeds: "An impressive or gorgeous ritual, to say nothing of its expensiveness, will never of itself fill any church, or produce any sort of effect upon them." It may be well for us to remember that we Lutherans have but few metropolitan churches, and that the great bulk of our people, and of those whom we may be expected to reach, in towns and villages, and in the country, are of the working classes. What these most need and most earnestly desire, is the plain preaching of God's word. They care but little for a particular set of views or practices. They will be most favorably influenced by personal contact of faithful, highminded, educated men who preach Christ in simplicity.

We invite special study of the second, third and fourth columns, for we assure the reader that in the parts only indicated by *name*, the correspondence is quite as close as it is in the parts fully written out.*

The fifth column is occupied by the German Mass (1526), which the Saxon Elector, by rescript, dated June 24, 1526, enjoined upon his pastors as the guide and model in holding their services.† Of the German Mass, Richter says, I. p. 35: "The following writing of Luther forms the basis of the Cultus in the Saxon countries." In the sixth column stands the great Brandenburg-Nuremberg, composed by Osiander and Brentz, and approved by Luther and Melancthon (Dr. Horn, *Ch. Rev.* I. p. 272). Next to Luther's two services, it has ever been regarded as one of the most influential Liturgies of the entire Lu-

*We extract the following from the Minutes of the General Council, 1887, p. 23: "The text of the Common Service has been completed by the sub-committee of preparation, under the direction of the Joint Committee of the three General Bodies. The Joint Committee has acceded to the request of the General Council that the Nunc Dimittis be placed in the Post Communion Service. The changes made in the Morning Service as printed in the English Church Book, by the General Council when it adopted the German Kirchenbuch, and which were ordered to be introduced in the Church Book, are all included in the Common Service. Apart from these changes, the Common Service, which was intended to present the common consent of the pure Lutheran Liturgies of the sixteenth century, does not differ noticeably from the Church Book in any part of the service appointed to be said by the congregation. The congregations can, therefore, continue to use the copies of the Church Book in their possession until they are worn out, in so far as the Morning Service, including the Communion is concerned." Did the General Synod at Harrisburg, or at Omaha, suspect that there would be no "noticeable" difference between the Common Service and the Church Book? Had she been told the real facts in the case, would she have so precipitated the publication of the Common Service? We understand that a committee is charged with the task of translating the COMMON SERVICE into German. Why not adopt the General Council's Kirchenbuch at once, and be done with it? Cannot the people be told in plain words just what they are getting? Why should the churches incur the expense of getting out a book which will differ in no *noticeable* respect from one already in existence?

†Seckendorf, II. 9, XVI. The Elector also required that liberty should be allowed in the use of ceremonies.

theran Church. Klöpffer calls it "the foundation of many other Agenda." Krauth says: "The Brandenburg-Nuremberg Liturgy of 1533 and the Saxon of 1539 belong to the greatest and most widely used Lutheran Liturgies of the sixteenth century." And again: "The Nuremberg and Saxon Orders were the most influential and widely used of the Lutheran Liturgies of the sixteenth century." (*Mercersburg Rev.*, 1869, pp. 603, 606). The Preface to the COMMON SERVICE calls it an "order of great importance." We have chosen the Mecklenburg for the seventh column, because it represents the fullest type of the sixteenth century, and is called "standard" by the Preface to the COMMON SERVICE. The Saxon, of which Dr. Krauth has just spoken so highly, fills the eighth column. It was composed by the theologians at Wittenberg, and approved by Luther. Daniel calls it "in the highest sense a genuine offspring of the Lutheran Church," (*Codex Lit.* II. p. 123), and selects it as the chief representative of the genuine old Lutheran Liturgy, p. 124. In the ninth column we have placed the Mark Brandenburg, which Daniel calls *Luthero-Romanizing*, and which Kliefoth calls *streng katholizierend*, and with the "prolixity" of which Luther found fault. It best represents the extreme of the reaction against the simplicity of Luther and the Wittenberg standard, which may now be easily ascertained by comparing the German Mass, the First Wittenberg (see p. 116), the Brandenburg-Nuremberg, the Saxon. If space would allow, we would cheerfully present the other two called "standard" by the Preface to the COMMON SERVICE, viz., the Lüneburg and the Calenburg. But the result would be only so much more testimony against the second, third and fourth columns. And beginning with Luther's German Mass (1526) and going on to the end of the century, through the seventy or more liturgies catalogued by Daniel, the exhibit would be in general the same. Columns two, three and four, would still hold the palm for elaborateness, "prolixity" and *Anhänglichkeit* to the Roman Ritual. For as Klöpffer has justly said: "The most (*die meisten*) of the Kirchenordnungen of Northern Germany, and a few of France, had from seven to ten parts, and were quite simple. The Brandenburg-Nuremberg (1533), which became the foundation of many other liturgies,

MEDIEVAL MASS.	LOHEI, 1852.	CHURCH BOOK, 1868.	COMMON SERVICE, 1888.
Invocation. Gloria Patri. Antiphon. Confession. Absolution. Introit (Anthem). Kyrie. Gloria in Excelsis. The Lord be with you. And with thy spirit. Collect. Epistle. Thanks be to God. Gradual. Salutation. Gospel. Glory be to thee, O Lord. Glory be to thee, O Christ. The Nicene Creed. Sermon. Offertory. Oblation. Sommum Corda. Preface, with Sanctus. Exhortation to Confession. Adjutorium. Our help, etc. Veni et recedat a te, etc. Confession. (I will confess. Confessional Prayer. Absolution. Introit. Gloria Patri. Kyrie. Gloria in Excelsis. The Lord be with you. And with thy spirit. Collect. Epistle. Hallelujah and Hymn. Salutation. Gospel announced Glory be to thee, O Lord. Glory be to thee, O Christ. The Nicene Creed. The Apostles' Creed. Sermon. Votum. Offertory. General Prayer. Hymn. The Lord be with you. And with thy spirit. Lift up your hearts. We lift them, etc. Preface. Sanctus.	Invocation. Exhortation to Confession. Adjutorium. Our help, etc. Veni et recedat a te, etc. Confession. (I will confess. Confessional Prayer. Absolution. Introit. Gloria Patri. Kyrie. Gloria in Excelsis. The Lord be with you. And with thy spirit. Collect. Epistle. Hallelujah with Psalm or Gospel announced. [Hymn. Glory be to thee, O Lord. Glory be to thee, O Christ. The Nicene Creed. The Apostles' Creed. Hymn. Sermon. Votum. Offertory. General Prayer. The Lord's Prayer. Hymn. The Lord be with you. And with thy spirit. Lift up your hearts. We lift them, etc. Preface. Sanctus. Exhortation. The Lord's Prayer. Consecration. Peace of the Lord, etc. Agnus Dei during Distribution. Nunc Dimittis. Thanksgiving Collect. Benedicamus. Benediction.	Invocation. Exhortation to Confession. Adjutorium. Our help, etc. Veni et recedat a te, etc. Confession. (I will confess. Confessional Prayer. Absolution. Introit. Gloria Patri. Kyrie. Gloria in Excelsis. The Lord be with you. And with thy spirit. Collect. Epistle. Hallelujah with Psalm or Gospel announced. [Hymn. Glory be to thee, O Lord. Glory be to thee, O Christ. The Nicene Creed. The Apostles' Creed. Hymn. Sermon. Votum. Offertory. General Prayer. The Lord's Prayer. Hymn. The Lord be with you. And with thy spirit. Lift up your hearts. We lift them, etc. Preface. Sanctus. Exhortation. The Lord's Prayer. Consecration. Peace of the Lord, etc. Agnus Dei during Distribution. Nunc Dimittis. Thanksgiving Collect. Benedicamus. Benediction.

*From third edition.

Finn Masses, Jan. 1-14.

[illegible]

ordered nine parts. The Brunswick-Wolfenbützel (1559 and 1615) has also nine parts. The Second Pomeranian, ten parts. The Mecklenburg (1554) has the same form in eleven parts, only that it begins with the Reformed Adjutorium and Deprecation, together with the Absolution."* A table that would include all or any great number of the Liturgies of Northern Germany would exhibit, as might be inferred from the discussion in section IV. of this paper, a good deal of variety; but "the common consent" would by *no means* exhibit the COMMON SERVICE; perhaps no more nearly exhibit it, than would the common consent of column five, six, seven and eight, for this group of four was more widely used and more influential, and in form and contents is more fully representative, than any other four that can be selected from the century. But compare it with columns two, three and four. The Mecklenburg (see Table) exceeds the maximum. Compare it with columns two, three and four. (c.) Take the average of columns five, six, seven and eight, and you will have about the average of the liturgical practice of Northern and Central Germany in the sixteenth century, when the entire population, except the Jews, were regarded as Christians. Compare this average with column *four*, the *proposed* liturgical practice of the Lutheran Church in America in the nineteenth century, when four-fifths of the population are yet to be reached with the Gospel. Beginning with the German Mass and taking

*This note from Klöpffer's Symbolik, p. 166, is worthy of careful study, (a.) It says the most of the liturgies of North Germany are really simple. Will any one call columns two, three and four, simple? (b.) It says the liturgies contain from seven to ten parts. Then eight and a half would be the average. The Brandenburg-Nuremberg (see Table) rises above the average. Yet compare it with columns two, three, and four. The Mecklenburg (see Table) exceeds the maximum. Compare it with columns two, three and four, (c.) Take the average of columns five, six, seven and eight, and you will have about the average of the Liturgical practice of Northern and Central Germany in the sixteenth century, when the entire population, except the Jews, were regarded as Christians. Compare this average with column *four*, the *proposed* liturgical practice of the Lutheran Church in America in the nineteenth century, when four-fifths of the population are yet to be reached with the Gospel.

all the liturgies of Northern and Central Germany, which can lay any *just* claim to the rank of being *standard*, we give it as our deliberate judgment that no fair and rational combination of anomalies and variations with fixed and common parts, will produce a liturgy exactly correspondent to the COMMON SERVICE. But granting that by some sort of editorial legerdemain, such a result might possibly be achieved, could a liturgy *obtained in that way*, be regarded as the "*normal Lutheran Liturgy*," and would it be *accepted* as the Liturgy of the "common consent?" Or if refuge should be taken under that convenient modification of the rule: "Where there is not entire agreement among them, the consent of the largest number of those of greatest weight," we are willing to bring out the four called "standard," by the Preface to the COMMON SERVICE, and to add to them Luther's German Mass and the "three Orders of great weight." But then we will throw down the gauntlet, and will say outright, Make the COMMON SERVICE out of these eight, who *will*, or *CAN*, or *DARE*.

ARTICLE IX.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

J. A. HILL & CO., NEW YORK.

The Lutherans in America. By Prof. E. J. Wolf, D. D., Gettysburg, Penna. With an Introduction by Henry Eyster Jacobs, D. D. pp. 544.

This volume comprises twenty chapters, varying from 7 to 50 pp. each. Lutheranism in this country is very properly prefaced by three chapters on the Church in general, the Reformation, and the origin, etc., of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. In the first of these chapters we have the design and indestructibility of the Church—her gradual decay and corruption, culminating in a deep-felt need of, and earnest calls for a reformation, and protests against the prevalent corruptions. Chap. II. gives the various providences concurring to produce the Reformation—the preparation of Luther for the critical hour, by the soul-struggles through which he passed before his feet were placed on the solid Rock,

and the new song of justification by faith gave utterance to the joy of of his heart in,

“Ich habe nün den Grund gefunden,
Der meinen Anker evig hält”—

the principle of the Reformation—its commencement and triumph. Chap. III. shows that the Lutheran Church was brought into existence by divine providence—points out the causes to which Luther's success is attributable—explains the titles of the Evangelical Church—and gives a brief sketch of Luther's most prominent co-laborers.

The IV., V, VI. and VII. chapters present us with a graphic sketch of the immigration to this country of Lutherans from Holland, Sweden and Germany—the religious persecutions which many of them endured in their native land—their immigration to America for conscience' sake—their early struggles and trials arising from renewed persecutions by the Dutch Calvinists, from confiscation of their property and even banishment, from the interruption of communication with the mother country, on account of poverty, oppression, wrongs, starvation, from the want of religious books and teachers, from their frequent failures to procure them, and from their dispersion over so wide an extent of territory. These chapters are full of thrilling interest, stirring the soul in its deepest recesses, sometimes to holy indignation, and then again to a noble purpose to labor and endure for the mother Church of the Reformation.

Chap. VIII. bestows a noble tribute to the learning, piety, and earnest zeal and self-sacrificing labors and hardships endured by Muhlenberg and his colleagues in laying the foundation of the Lutheran Church in this country. It tells also of their enemies and opposition, of their harmony among themselves, their popularity and wonderful success, the introduction of a common Liturgy, and the formation of the first synod in 1748. Then follows, in Chap. IX., an account of the ravages and devastations of war from the outbreak of the French-Indian war through the Revolution to the inauguration of President Washington, showing its effects upon the churches, in secularizing the ministry, in the dearth of faithful pastors, in scattering and disbanding congregations, in the ruin of houses of worship, in the introduction of all kinds of immorality, infidelity and rationalism, in retarding education, besides poverty, internal dissensions and widespread and deep-rooted indifference to religion. But a blessed change comes—the gold is purified in the crucible. Faithful pastors multiply, missionary labors are again resumed, new congregations are organized, new and vigorous life is being felt in the churches, four new synods spring into being in New York, in the Carolinas, in Ohio, and in Maryland and Virginia.

Chap. X. brings us to the formation of the General Synod in 1821. Upon this soon follows the establishment and opening of the theological Seminary at Gettysburg in 1825 and 1826—and a little later, a classical

school in the same place, which soon grows into Pennsylvania College. Then follow in rapid succession, education societies, an increase of the ministry, missionary organizations, Sunday-schools, church-literature, a general spirit of revival, the formation of new district synods, and the growth of the general body, aggregating in 1860, 26 synods spread over almost our entire Union, and comprising two-thirds of the Lutheran Church in this country. But a sad reverse follows. The outbreak of the Civil War causes the withdrawal of the synods south of the Potomac. Two divergent tendencies in the general body culminate in its disruption at Fort Wayne in 1866. The chapter closes with the present strength of the General Synod.

Chap. XI. gives the history of the Independent Synods—the Tennessee, the Joint Synod of Ohio, the German Synod of Iowa, the Buffalo, those of the Norwegians and Danes, and the Icelandic Association: their origin, trials, growth, institutions, missionary labors, doctrinal position, present strength, etc.

Chap. XII. gives an account of the early immigration to this country of the so-called Missourians, and of their organization into congregations under their first and most prominent leaders—Stephan, the two Walthers, Grabau, Wyneken, Sihler and Loehe. Also the formation of the Missouri Synod in 1847, and of the Synodical Conference in 1872—their labors, controversies, institutions, unprecedented growth, publications, and numerical strength.

Chap. XIII. relates the origin of the General Council; its early hope and anticipation of uniting all the divisions of the Lutheran Church in this country into one general and harmonious organization; its failure in realizing this hope; its difficulties; its doctrinal basis; the Four Points; its collegiate, theological and eleemosynary institutions; its progress and numerical strength. It also makes honorable mention of the New York Ministerium, the Pittsburg Synod with her children, the synods of Canada, Texas, and Minnesota, and the Swedish Augustana Synod.

In Chap. XIV. we have the origin, formation, doctrinal basis, institutions, labors, and prospects of the United Synod of the South.

Chap. XV. pays a merited tribute to the Lutheran Church as a Church of Culture both in the old and new world. The Reformers all occupied University chairs. Muhlenberg and his colleagues, education, academies, colleges, theological seminaries, female seminaries, parochial schools, the education of orphans, catechisation; Lutheran publications and periodicals.

Chap. XVI. is devoted to the Lutheran Church and Missions. It repels and shows the falsity of the charge, that "the conversion of the heathen occupied no place in the thoughts of the great leader of the Reformation," and that "the followers of Luther for more than a century entertained the same prejudice against missions." The Danish-

Halle missions in India antedate those of the Church of England by a full century; and the Canstein Biblical Institute founded at Halle for the circulation of the Scriptures was ninety-six years in advance of the British and Foreign Bible Society. Lutheran missions in India and Africa. The present Home Missions of the Lutheran Church.

The indebtedness of other churches to the Lutheran, especially the Episcopal Churches of England and the United States, the Methodist Church, and those of the Presbyterian and other Calvinistic bodies, the German Reformed and the Moravians—for their creeds, liturgies, translation of the Scriptures, etc.,—form the theme of Chap. XVII. The Lutheran Church the mother of the Protestant Churches—not a sister among sisters, but the mother of them all.

Chap. XVIII. on the distinguishing doctrines and features of the Lutheran Church, is itself well worth the price of the book. It points out the comprehensiveness, the breadth, the fulness, and the Scripturalness of the Lutheran system. Also, wherein she differs from the Roman Catholic Church; as well as from all other churches "which in any way limit mercy or make grace contingent upon aught but Word and Sacrament." These differences are succinctly noticed as they relate to the assurance of salvation based on apostolical succession, election, the mode of baptism, inward consciousness, personal efforts, repentance, and reformation. These differences are again shown as they relate to a limited atonement, to infant baptism, to the sacraments, to baptismal grace, to the Person of Christ. Her pure, scriptural Liturgical service, the purity with which she holds the doctrine of justification by faith, her observance of the Christian Church-Year, and her childlike, calm and cheerful faith and frame of mind, are all pointed out as distinguishing features of the Lutheran Church.

Chap. XIX. points out the strength of the Lutheran Church in the United States and Europe. It finds her strength not only in the number of her ministers, congregations, and communicants, but more significantly in the fulness and emphasis with which she preaches the truth as it is in Jesus, in the clearness with which her faith is defined and the fulness with which it is set forth, in her Symbols; in her great devotion to the instruction and indoctrination of her youth; in the general prevalence and growth of liberality amongst her people; in her educational institutions; her Publishing Houses, and her literature sent forth in some six or seven different languages.

The volume closes with Chap. XX. on the future of the Lutheran Church in America. This chapter gives a number of sound and prominent reasons which unmistakably indicate the future increasing prosperity, and the expansion and prevalence of the Lutheran Church throughout this entire country.

In writing this book Dr. Wolf has done the Lutheran Church a good service. It ought to find its way into every Lutheran family. Besides,

it will prove a blessing to those of other communions, especially by enabling them to make a truer estimate of the mother Church of the Reformation. We bespeak for the book an extensive circulation.

"Glorious things of thee are spoken,
Zion, city of our God ;
He, whose word cannot be broken,
Form'd thee for his own abode :
On the Rock of Ages founded,
What can shake thy sure repose ?
With salvation's walls surrounded,
Thou may'st smile at all thy foes." H. ZIEGLER.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

The Viking Age. The Early History, Manners and Customs of the Ancestors of the English speaking nations. Illustrated from the Antiquities discovered in mounds, cairns and bogs as well as from the Ancient Sagas and Eddas. By Paul B. Du Chaillu, author of "Land of the Midnight Sun," etc. With 1366 Illustrations and Map. Two Vols. 8vo. pp. 591, 562.

The subject matter, the story told, and the execution combine to make this the gem of the season in the book world. Its peculiar interest is that it traces the cosmogony and mythology, life, religion, laws and customs of the progenitors of the English-speaking nations of to-day. For whence have come the energy, the courage, the progress and prosperity, the sea-faring and self-government which everywhere mark English-speaking communities, except from the glorious and never-to-be-forgotten countries of the North, the birth-place of a new epoch in the history of mankind.

No land has bequeathed to us a literature, giving so minute and comprehensive an account of the life of a people. The original records are indeed far away. "The parchments upon which the history of the North is written, are begrimed by the smoke of the Icelandic cabin and worn by the centuries which have passed over them," but the author has spent eight years and a half in collecting, studying and sifting them, and converting the Sagas and Eddas into a readable and fascinating book. With characteristic faithfulness he has not been content with the translations of other persons, but has in every case gone to the original documents and adopted his own rendering of them.

It is not a work with a continuous story. It is too comprehensive and encyclopædic for that. But it is a mass of well-selected and well arranged material covering the origin of the Norse people, their earliest antiquities, their stone, bronze and iron ages, their superstitions, their legends, their gods, their family life, their slavery, their weapons, wars, fleets, occupations, architecture, feasts, sports, poetry, music, the expeditions and great deeds of the Vikings, and finally their discovery and

settlement of Iceland, Greenland and America. The illustrations, which are of superior quality, would alone form an extensive library. The whole makes a magnificent addition to our historical literature.

History of the United States of America during the first Administration of Thomas Jefferson. By Henry Adams. Two Vols. pp. 446, 456.

Comparatively few Americans are familiar with the new departure in the Republic which was inaugurated by the administration of Thomas Jefferson, a revolution which the philosopher President described eleven years after his retirement from office "as real a revolution in the principles of our government as that of 1776 was in its form." His was "the first administration," it has been well said, "democratic in spirit, if not in name." The reading public will be sure to welcome a work specially devoted to the history of that administration, written in the spirit of judicial fairness and giving abundant evidence of painstaking thoroughness in the investigation of Spanish, French, British and American archives.

To many the political characteristics of this eventful and brilliant period of our government, will be the matter of chief interest, the conflict between federalism and republicanism, the acquisition of Louisiana, the progress made in the restriction of slavery, while others will experience strange sensations as they read the graphic review in the six initial chapters, of the physical, economical and intellectual conditions of the country at the beginning of this century: a review which shows that our astounding progress began only with the century.

"Except in political arrangement the interior was little more civilized than in 1750." "With the exception that half a million people had crossed the Alleghunies and were struggling with difficulties all their own, in an isolation like that of Jutes and Angles in the fifth century, America, so far as concerned physical problems, had changed little in fifty years." "The voyage to Europe was comparatively more comfortable and more regular than the voyage from New York to Albany, or through Long Island Sound to Providence."

In view of the immense obstacles of nature, the experiment of a single republican government was deemed hopeless. Physical contact alone could make one country of the isolated empires, and physical contact was deemed impossible by the wisest men of the year 1800. "In becoming politically independent of England, the old thirteen provinces developed little more commercial intercourse with each other in proportion to their wealth and population than they had maintained in colonial days. Each group of states lived a life apart." When in the summer of 1800 the government was transferred to what was regarded as a fever-stricken morass, the half-finished White House stood in a naked field overlooking the Potomac, with the awkward Department buildings near

it, a single row of brick houses and a few isolated dwellings within sight, and nothing more, until across a swamp, a mile and a half away, the shapeless, unfinished Capitol was seen, two wings without a body. Never did hermit or saint condemn himself to solitude more consciously than Congress and the Executive in removing the government from Philadelphia to Washington; the discontented men clustered together in eight or ten boarding-houses as near as possible to the Capitol, and there lived like a convent of monks, with no other amusement or occupation than that of going from their lodging to the chambers and back again."

Philadelphians will feel complacent over the admission that their city in 1800 was the intellectual centre as well as the capital of the nation, and that it had at that time "gathered a more agreeable society, fashionable, literary and political, than could be found anywhere, except in a few capital cities of Europe." And Pennsylvanians generally will once more see good grounds for the distinction given their Commonwealth as the Keystone State.

Word Studies in the New Testament. By Marvin R. Vincent, D. D. Vol. II. The Writings of John: The Gospel, The Epistles, The Apocalypse. pp. 607.

We have been waiting impatiently for another volume of this valuable work, which offers very substantial assistance in getting at the clear meaning of biblical terms. Its character is intermediate between a Lexicon and a Commentary. It takes up, like the former, individual words, but instead of following an alphabetical order, it follows the order of their occurrence in the text, paying little attention to the connexion, and not confining itself, like Cremer's Lexicon, to terms of special importance, nor to difficult passages.

Helpful as the work must prove, as well to the unlearned as to students, its scope is not such as to render either Commentary or Lexicon superfluous. It deals with verbal interpretation, the unfolding of the thought being incidental. The peculiar interest and importance attached to a word, as it is traced through its classic sense and its Septuagint and Apocryphal use, is brought out notably in the discussion of *ὁ λόγος*, to which are given ten pages.

Like nearly all helps to Bible interpretation this fails us just in a number of those passages where help is especially desired. Take, as an instance, *πεπληρωμένη* which is a favorite word with John, but the exact sense of which is in certain passages somewhat obscure. Its occurrence in John 3 : 29 is not mentioned. At 7 : 8 the reader finds only this: "Lit., *has been fulfilled*. So Rev., *is not yet fulfilled*." At 15 : 11 simply. "Rev., more correctly, *may be fulfilled*." At 1 John 1 : 4, "More correctly, *fulfilled*."

The desire of having the chapter indicated at the head of each page must be shared by every one who uses the work.

The present volume deals exclusively with the writings of St. John. Volume I. covered the Synoptic Gospels, The Acts, and The Epistles of Peter, James and Jude. We hope that a third volume devoted to the writings of Paul will not be long delayed.

A. C. ARMSTRONG & SON, NEW YORK.

On sale by J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia.

Systematic Theology. A Compendium and Common-Place Book Designed for the Use of Theological Students. By Augustus Hopkins Strong, D. D., President and Professor of Biblical Theology in the Rochester Theological Seminary. Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged. pp. 750. \$5.00.

The thinking world has not outgrown theology. It is but a few years since this solid octavo of nearly 800 pages of rigorously condensed and closely printed matter, was first published, and it was not even intended for the public market but as a handbook for the use of students for the ministry, and now a second edition is called for. In the meanwhile Dr. Shedd's great work has appeared and commanded a wide circulation.

And its popularity is not due to any "New Theology" in it. While abreast with modern theological opinions, the work is a compendium of the old faith of Christendom, presented in fresh forms and with an irenic temper. There *is* no new theology. There can be no progress in revealed truth, that is, no new discoveries, such as are witnessed in the domain of mechanics or of natural science.

Old theories, long forgotten, turn up once again from time to time and seek favor by the claim of novelty and progress, but the church historian is not deceived by the modern dress in which they appear.

In theology what is true is not new, and what is new is not true. There may be new applications of old doctrines, adaptations to changed conditions of life and to new modes of thought, as there may be development into larger and clearer statements, but the truth of God remains *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus creditum est*.

Dr. Strong's work is throughout one of great merit, and must prove a valuable help to clear thinking and to a thorough knowledge of Scripture. -He has subjected the first edition to a careful revision and added more than seven hundred new references and quotations. For a more extended notice our readers are referred to the January issue of the *QUARTERLY*, 1887.

The Human Moral Problem. An Inquiry into Some of the Dark Points Connected with the Human Necessities for a Supernatural Saviour. By R. R. Conn. pp. 69.

A somewhat unusual feature of this little work is the form of Questions and Answers in which it is written. Another mark is the some-

what unusual effort of a layman to enlighten the world on some of the dark religious problems, with which the best trained theologians of the ages have grappled. Such a writer has naturally a good deal to say about logical absurdities and physiological impossibilities. What his sweeping judgments may be worth can be inferred from the following question and answer: "What then are we forced to believe?" *Ans.* That the claim made by some theologians, that there is in human nature a general spirit of rebellion against God that makes us delight in being disobedient for its own sake, is not true." To such a philosopher, Frederick the Great would have observed: "Er kennt the infame Raçe nicht."

Imago Christi: The Example of Christ. By Rev. James Stalker, M. A., Author of "The Life of Jesus Christ," "The Life of St. Paul," etc. Introduction by Rev. Wm. M. Taylor, D. D., LL. D. pp. 332.

Christ is here presented as our example in the home, in the State, in the Church, as a friend, in society, as a man of prayer, as a student of Scripture, as a worker, a sufferer, a philanthropist, winner of souls, preacher, teacher, controversialist, a man of feeling, and as an influence. After an excellent introductory chapter on Thomas à Kempis *Imitation of Christ*, he treats of the Saviour's example, in the different aspects just named, in a devout and loving spirit, and with such clearness and suggestiveness, that the reader will not fail to be impressed and benefited. It is much in the same tone as the world-famed book of Thomas à Kempis, and like it will conduce to devout and reverent thought

The Salt-Cellars. Being a Collection of Proverbs, together with homely Notes thereon. By C. H. Spurgeon. pp. 334.

This collection of proverbs,—some of them quaint, many of them familiar, a large portion of a "scriptural sort," and all of them well-chosen—is arranged in alphabetical order. Those in this volume begin with A and end with L, and the remainder will likely be included in a second volume. Most of the "homely notes" are just to the point and very suggestive. We give an example:

Proverb: "He who cannot swim should never dive."

Note: "Keep out of matters with which you are not practically acquainted. In business do not run risks to which you are not equal. In theology do not go into speculations which carry you away."

Here is another:

Proverb: "He's a mouse who feeds on other people's cheese."

Note: "Shame on able-bodied men, who live upon their wives, or pick up the doles of charity. We libel a mouse in likening such a

wretch to it. Such fellows want the old Dutch system tried on them:—to be put in a cell, into which the water comes so fast that they can only save their lives by pumping as hard as they can. What a picture it would be to see them taking to the pump when the water was nearly up to their necks!"

The proverbs have the three essentials of "shortness, sense and salt," and the same may said of Mr. Spurgeon's notes on them.

The Sermon Bible. Psalms LXXVII. to Song of Solomon. pp. 476.

This is the third volume of the "Sermon Bible" series. The first ended at 2d. Samuel and the third with Psalm lxxvi. It will be seen, from the ground covered, that these cannot be full sermons on the successive passages. They are, in fact, extracts from printed sermons, usually one on a text of Scripture, sometimes more than one, but seldom is any single selection more than a page in length.

Helps for the preacher are multiplying, some of them good, others not. These books will prove useful in suggesting methods of treatment or starting the mind on a line of thought. They represent an immense amount of sermon reading and a wide acquaintance with sermonic literature. Chief among their good features are the references to sermons and books given with the texts.

FUNK & WAGNALLS, NEW YORK.

A Manual of Introduction to the New Testament. By Dr. Bernhard Weiss. Translated from the German by A. J. K. Davidson. Two Vols. pp. 420, 426. \$2.00 per vol.

The object of the learned author in the preparation of this work was to furnish a manual characterized by the best methodical arrangement. It is based on the view that the main thing in an Introduction to the New Testament is neither criticism nor apologetics, but "the actual initiation into a living, historical knowledge of Scripture."

It presents first in brief review the Science of Introduction in Patristic, Mediæval and Reformation times, the methods and results of Richard Simon and J. D. Michaelis, Semler, Eichhorn, De Wette, and others. A section is devoted to the Tübingen School and its opponents, and another to the Present State of the Science. Then follows a critical examination into the History of the Origin of the New Testament Canon, after which comes an exhaustive treatise of the Apostle Paul and his Epistles with an analysis of their contents.

The second volume opens with a review of the Epistle to the Hebrews, its Authorship, Readers and Analysis. Next follows the examination of the Revelation of John, the Brethren of Jesus, the Catholic Epistles and the Historical Books.

The work closes with an Appendix giving a minute and most instructive History of the "New Testament Text," its external form, divisions,

corruptions and emendations, an enumeration of the principal manuscripts, their characteristics, &c., with an account of the Ancient Versions, and finally a review of the Printed Text and Text-Criticism and the Philological Elaboration of the Text.

A more thorough and valuable work in this domain is not in existence. Its equal is not to be found in the English language. It covers a subject of the greatest importance and it is treated by a careful and independent judgment and by a mind in sympathy with the Scriptures. Though in the main a work for students, the intelligent lay-reader will find in it a mine of profitable instruction.

HUNT & EATON, NEW YORK.

The Lesson Commentary. On the International Sunday-School Lessons for 1890. By Rev. Jesse L. Hurlbut, D. D. pp. 340.

The Sunday-school teacher of to-day cannot complain that he is left to his own resources in preparing for his class. Even if he has no access to commentaries, he can have what he wants more ready to hand. Besides the lesson helps of his own denomination, there are other periodicals which, week by week and month by month, furnish him with comments on the lessons. And, if he wants them in convenient form for the whole year, he can have them in such a volume as the one before us. It has been prepared with evident care under the general supervision of the editor but on the principle of the "division of labor," no less than seven men taking part. But well as they have done their work, it is not adapted throughout for all denominations but only for the one it represents. The denominational helps must, after all, take the lead with the teacher who would be true to the doctrines of his own Church. For example, the lesson for Oct. 12th, on the Lord's Supper, makes it merely a commemorative feast. There is not a word about it as one of the *means of grace*, and the rich, comforting doctrine of the Lutheran Church concerning it finds no favor. In this lesson, at least, the book will not do for the Lutheran teacher. It has several good maps and is well illustrated.

The pamphlet of *Supplemental Lessons for the Sunday-School* by the same author, is a *multum in parvo* of Biblical instruction—an excellent little hand-book for the teacher on matters geographical, biographical, historical on the Bible as a book and the books of the Bible, and other aspects of instruction supplemental to the usual lessons.

Old Heroes. The Hittites of the Bible. By J. N. Fradenburgh, Ph. D., D. D., Member of the American Oriental Society, etc. Author of "The Bible Illustrated," etc. pp. 166.

Repeatedly mentioned in the earlier history of the Bible, and briefly referred to in the classics, the Hittites, once the mightiest of nations, whose empire extended from the Nile to the Euphrates, and who, according to Gladstone, took part in the siege of Troy, were for more

than two thousand years unknown to historical writers. Now the discovery and decipherment of the monuments offer striking and abundant confirmation of the allusions of the Scriptures to this ancient race. The skeptical sneers which these references formerly provoked, and the charge of their "unhistorical" character, are effectually confuted by these brief pages. The reader, upon laying down this modest volume, will heartily agree with the author that the exercise of a little more scholarly caution in the announcement of discoveries of biblical mistakes and inaccuracies, is very desirable alike in the interests of truth and of the reputation of scholarship.

The Gospel in the Book of Numbers. By Rev. Lewis R. Dunn, D. D.

This is a homiletical commentary. Chiefly it consists of exhortations. The diction is not always elegant. The thought is sometimes crude. As the reader "follows carefully through these pages to see how precious and sparkling are the diamond truths which throw their deathless lustre on our souls," he comes upon much that probably was never in the mind of the author of the book of Numbers. But on the commonly received principle that the words of the Bible are unlike the words of other books and can be held to mean any thing and everything moral and evangelical that can be forced into them—the test of the correctness of an interpretation being the fitness of what is taught to edify—this book may pass with others. As usefulness does not always depend on scholarship, it may do an excellent service. Its teachings are bold, strong, clear and persuasive, and will not fail to be interesting to a large class of readers.

J. K. D.

The Man of Galilee. By Atticus G. Haygood. pp. 156.

The substance of these apologetic lectures was originally given by Dr. Haygood to his classes at Emory College. They deal with the old questions, "Did the Evangelists invent Jesus?" "Is Jesus an ideal Jew of the time of Tiberius?" "Jesus and Myths," "The Son of Man and Sin," "Jesus the One Universal Character," &c., &c. The author grasps the force of the current objections of unbelief and disposes of them with great learning, close argument and a clear and sprightly style. As a clever, popular defence of the faith it deserves a wide circulation, and it is sure to make interesting and profitable reading.

The Book Divine; or, How Do I Know the Bible is the Word of God?

By Jacob Emory Price. pp. 194.

The principal proofs offered in successive chapters is its unity amid variety, its harmony with profane history and with physical science, the prophetic element and the central person and life, Jesus Christ. A cue to the scientific quality of the volume is the statement in the preface that it is composed of a series of Sunday evening lectures, delivered in

the course of ordinary religious services, "delivered for the greater part extemporaneously and reported stenographically."

The explanation of the conflict between religion and science on the ground that scientists employ the faculty of reason, while religion, assigning to reason its proper realm, calls into exercise largely the faith faculty, is not likely to convert many skeptics.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN & CO., BOSTON AND NEW YORK.

The Church in Modern Society. By Julius H. Ward.

There can be but few earnest Christians in the United States who do not know something of the hinderances to Christian work caused by what is mentioned in this volume as over-much individualization. Individualization is desirable, one of the best products of the Reformation. During the Middle Ages the Church reigned supreme and was despotic, keeping the state, the family and the individual out of their proper fields. But at present, under the rule of voluntarism, prevalent in this country, the "institutional Church," as the author calls it—which we understand to be much the same thing as the Church considered as the Church—has been lost sight of, to such an extent has it been broken up into competing bodies, some of them minutely small. The book before us argues that the need of our time and country is the re-establishment of a right balance between the Church and the individual, the individual to retain his freedom, at the same time the Church to retain its integrity. It is an argument for co-operation, that the "collective Church"—the Church as made up of all the denominations—may present an undivided front before the world and so exert the moral and spiritual influence which it ought to exert, a function of the Church with which neither the state, nor the family, nor the individual can dispense. There is much excellent suggestion in the book before us; its main defect is that it takes much the same position as the American House of Bishops in their Declaration of 1886. The stoutest adherent of any of the denominations cannot but find its argument exceedingly liberal and persuasive; but it is quite apparent that even Mr. Ward, who would give up for the sake of unity all other unessentials, cannot yield the "historic episcopate."

J. K. D.

The Struggle for Immortality. By Elizabeth Stuart Phelps.

It is a question whether what life the chapters of this book might have had as contributions to the *North American Review* and the *Forum*, in which magazines many of them have already appeared, was not all that they deserved. Undoubtedly there is much force in the language; some of the paragraphs are brilliant; and the author's purpose appears generally that of an intellectual, noble, Christian woman. But she has such a habit of overstatement as spoils all. The argument which runs through the disconnected chapters is difficult to follow, if it

exist. Meanwhile smart things are everywhere on the surface. "A damned baby at best was a theory. Nobody ever saw one." "We care no more whether we are to be punished for the sin of Adam, having enough of our own to look to." "We do not hold that the Almighty troubled himself about the cloak that Paul forgot at Troas. No exegete calls the All-wise Being to account for the discrepancies between Matthew and John." "Robert Ingersoll is the direct descendant of the Westminster Confession." "It is an undecorated fact that if Jesus Christ were to enter almost any of our influential churches to-day, he would be shown into the back gallery." "It is a well-known fact that ardent workers in the temperance movement find the grog-shops and the churches their chief obstacles. You soon learn to count the liquor-dealer and the communicant almost equally out of rank with you in your solitary battle." Tastes differ, but while we acknowledge that such a way of putting things, as the above quotations exemplify, may be impressive, we do not admire it; nor do we believe that it can have much influence, except on such readers as prefer the sensational to the true. As that class however is large, Mrs. Phelps' book may be popular.

J. K. D.

American Religious Leaders. Jonathan Edwards. By Alexander V. G. Allen, D. D.

This volume is interesting as a biography. Jonathan Edwards graduated from Yale College in 1719 when sixteen years of age. After some years, during most of which he was tutor in Yale College, he became in 1727 the colleague of his grandfather, Rev. John Stoddard, pastor of the Congregational Church of Northampton, Mass. There he married Sarah Pierrepont, a woman of extraordinary beauty and accomplishments as well as piety. In Northampton Edwards preached with much success—a marked revival, known in the history of New England as the "great awakening," beginning under his ministry—until 1749, when by a large vote of that congregation his relation to them as pastor was severed on account of trouble growing out of a case of discipline. In 1751 Edwards removed to Stockbridge, where he labored as a missionary among the Indians, at the same time preaching to a small congregation of whites at the settlement. In 1757 he was called to succeed his son-in-law Rev. Aaron Burr in the presidency of Princeton College. But he had hardly more than taken his place in that institution before he died, 1758.

But it is chiefly as a criticism of Edward's writings that Prof. Allen's book is interesting. In his secluded home on what was then the extreme western edge of civilization, with no companions who were his equals and small access to books, Edwards thought out a philosophical and theological system, which will make his name famous so long as American literature lasts. He was a thinker from his boyhood, projecting great works on the Mind and on the Natural Sciences, while still a col-

lege student. It is a striking fact, that such a man, as he afterwards became, should in his boyhood have given promise in so different a field, writing "an elaborate and instructive account of the habits of the field spider, based upon his own observation." He was ever a controversialist, and even in his sermons presented and defended his theories, so that they must still be read in order to a full understanding of what Edwards taught. To say that, notwithstanding their didactic nature and although read closely from the manuscript with little or no gesture, those sermons when delivered "thrilled" his congregation, and that unlike most sermons coming down to us from the past they have "the fire of life and reality still burning in them," is to give them high praise, which however is no more than they deserve. Edwards wrote many treatises, of which the best known is, of course, that on the Will, published in 1754, though many will agree with Prof. Allen in giving a preference to his work on the Religious Affections. The work before us does justice to Edward's originality and wonderful force and subtlety as a reasoner, as also to the extraordinary devoutness—the more extraordinary in a person of his bent of mind—which from the beginning to the end characterized his writings as well as his public and private life. Prof. Allen finds however an idealism closely resembling Berkeley's, if not the same and taken from Berkeley, underlying much of his philosophy, and even a trend, of which he thinks Edwards himself was all unconscious, towards pantheism. Spinoza as often as Berkeley seems to have come to Prof. Allen's mind, when he read Edward's treatises on the Nature of Virtue and the Last End of God in Creation. He finds also that while Edwards in his treatise on the Will maintained the sovereignty of God, that sovereignty in Edward's view is only an eternal necessity to which God himself is subject, and that while he maintained that man has freedom of will, that freedom of will, in Edward's view, being only a certainty of his acting according to a preponderating motive, which is a cause over which, according to Edwards, he has no power, is a delusion.

There will be a difference of opinion as to the justice of some of Prof. Allen's criticisms. The publishers in assigning to him this work selected a man remarkably fit as regards his familiarity with his subject and the contemporaneous philosophy and the early history of the New England churches, a man besides who gives evidence on every page of a disposition to be fair, but who on some accounts could hardly be expected to look on his subject from the standpoint of a helpful sympathy.

The name of Jonathan Edwards is a great one. His fame will not be lessened, but increased by the very able and honest book before us. Every student interested in the history of the American churches should read it, and, better yet, should seek a good knowledge of at least some of the writings of Jonathan Edwards at first hand. The best service of this book will probably be to convince the English-speaking religious world of that duty.

J. K. D.

George Washington. By Henry Cabot Lodge. In two volumes. pp. 341, 399.

It is a rare specimen of the fitness of things that the life of the greatest American should be written by America's foremost biographer. Belonging to the "American Statesman" series so elegantly gotten up by this house, the present work is the gem among gems and is destined to become the standard life of the immortal Washington.

Without disparaging the splendid biographies that have preceded this, Mr. Lodge is doubtless altogether correct when he approvingly quotes McMaster's remark that "George Washington is an unknown man." While all men have praised him, comparatively few have understood him. It is, therefore, a great public blessing that a writer possessed of the historico-critical faculty, who can view his subject with the light of a century, and who has been able to bestow on it years of careful investigation, should give to us in this centennial year of our government, this grand and masterful portrait of Washington and his career.

Americans can see here as they never did before, "a man so great in mind and character that he could rise at a single bound from the level of a provincial planter to the heights of a great national leader," a man who could achieve the independence of a nation, and that, too, when in the greatest crisis of the struggle he had literally nothing human to rely on but his own stern will and strong head, his "grim tenacity of purpose."

Notwithstanding the laudable effort of Mr. Lodge to divest his subject of the myths by which it has been persistently overlaid, and to remove some of that lofty isolation from his species in which Washington has been viewed, there still moves before us "the noblest figure that ever stood in the forefront of a nation's life," a sublime spirit whose head was never turned, whose judgment was never confused, whose nerve was never shaken, either by disaster or victory, by calumny or adulation.

A noble enrichment of our literary treasures, these volumes are to be studied rather than read. Properly studied they must stimulate our patriotism, elevate our intellectual tone and kindle the moral sensibilities.

The Beginnings of New England, or The Puritan Theocracy in its Relations to Civil and Religious Liberty. By John Fiske. 16 mo. pp. 296.

Prof. Fiske has the faculty of showing what history really is, and this alone gives to his historical writings an extraordinary value. With the method of a philosopher and the art of painter he employs dates, events, and revolutions as a perspective through which his readers view the evolution of great principles and the growth of beneficent institutions. For the "Beginnings of New England" he goes back to A. D.

476, since not the overthrow of Roman power, but its indefinite extension and expansion date from that year.

Readers, generally, have grown familiar with the author's charming and lofty style. Ample and accurate scholarship marks all his writings. Perhaps his noblest attribute is that calm, impartial, judgment that delights to recognize the debt of gratitude which modern civilization owes to the Roman Catholic Church, and the noble part which the Church of England, with its long line of learned and liberal divines, has played in history, as well as the sturdy virtues of the Puritans, "whose watchwords were texts from Holy Writ, whose battle-cries were hymns of praise."

So again, admitting that "it is not easy to speak of Calvin with enthusiasm, as it comes natural to speak of the genial, whole-souled, many-sided, mirth- and song-loving Luther," Prof. F. claims "it would be hard to overrate the debt which mankind owe to Calvin. The spiritual father of Coligny, of William the Silent, and of Cromwell must occupy a foremost rank among the champions of modern democracy."

Chap. I. is devoted to the Roman Idea and the English Idea of nation-making. The succeeding chapters treat of the Puritan Exodus, The Planting of New England, The New England Confederacy, King Philip's War, and The Tyranny of Andros. The Puritan treatment of the Indian is shown to have been more humane and just than has generally been believed, and the "Blue Laws" never had an existence, except in the Tory brain of Dr. Peters, who was a veritable Munchausen.

The American Book of Church Services, with Selections for Responsive Reading and full Order of Service, for the Celebration of Matrimony, for Funerals, and also other occasionals ministrations. Also an ample list of Selections of Sacred Music, with references for the guidance of pastors and choristers. Arranged by Edward Hungerford. pp. 374.

One of the most manifest and powerful movements in the Church of to-day is the almost universal tendency toward liturgical forms in worship. Denominations that formerly condemned these spiritual aids as the symbols of formalism, are coming to see that if public worship is to be rescued from the dreariest formalism, it must be by a return to that orderly system which has characterized the Christian Church in its best ages. The readiness with which some of the most aggressive communions are prepared to return to the Liturgy, in the face of their record against it, is one of the surest signs that denominationalism is surrendering to the Church universal.

The difference between the manufacture of a Liturgy for a denomination that has had none, and the inheritance of a Liturgy by a Church that has been exceptionally rich in liturgical development, becomes very apparent in the comparison of this "American Book" with the *Common*

Service of the Lutheran Church. Even the relative length is significant. The *Common Service* contains 145 pp. This 374. The rendering of the former occupies 15 minutes, that of the latter, as the writer witnessed in Dr. Storr's church, Brooklyn, 45 minutes. How popular this new departure among the Congregationalists has become, may be judged by the endorsement this work has received from G. P. Fisher of Yale, President Seelye, of Smith College, Dr. T. T. Munger and other progressive men, who, to adopt a favorite phrase with some people, have "their faces turned to the front." In the Apostles' Creed the form used is "He descended into Hell." These words the rubrics say, may be omitted, which is certainly a better alternative than the utterly meaningless shift, "the place of departed spirits." In the Lord's Prayer the general usage of the Church is conformed to, "Forgive us our trespasses." At the close of all services "silent prayer" is proposed, "closed by an organ chord," an observance which must commend itself to all Christian people. In the responsive reading of the Psalms which is becoming so popular, the Congregationalists, like the Episcopalians, must consent to have the Lutherans show them that the Psalms which were mostly written for responsive reading, cannot be read in accordance with the original by alternate verses, but by the proper division of each verse. Thus only can the full sense be brought out.

Portraits of Friends. By John Campbell Shairp, Author of "Culture and Religion," "Aspects of Poetry," etc. With a Sketch of Principal Shairp, by Professor William Young Sellers, and an etched Portrait. pp. 212. \$1.25.

These character sketches and personal reminiscences were contributed at different times by Principal Shairp, to various periodicals and biographies. They are now presented to the public in convenient book form. They are instructive, interesting and pleasing papers, being marked by the author's characteristic charm of style. Principal Shairp was a man of generous, affectionate and enthusiastic nature, of lofty motives and purposes, of noble character and impulses, of fine literary tastes and attainments. He formed strong and lasting friendships. His friends whose portraits he has here sketched, in his graceful and attractive way, were such distinguished men as Thomas Erskine, Bishop Cotton, Dr. John Brown, Norman Macleod, John Macleod Campbell, John Mackintosh of Geddes and Arthur Hugh Clough. As master at Rugby, professor and principal at St. Andrews and professor of poetry in the University of Oxford, he achieved distinction in his work. He was fond of the country, and made frequent journeys on foot through some of the most picturesque parts of Scotland. Wordsworth and Scott had a powerful influence in determining his literary development. Those readers who have been instructed and delighted by his writings will be glad to have this personal portrait of himself by his intimate

friend, Professor W. Y. Sellers, with which the volume is introduced. This sketch by Professor Sellers was originally prepared for Professor Knight's memorial volume of Principal Shairp and his friends, published in 1888. We can heartily commend these "Portraits of Friends on account of the eminent and useful men with whom they are concerned, the high and worthy reputation of the author, their excellent style and the good influence they will have.

J. B.

American Religious Leaders. Wilbur Fisk. By George Prentice, D. D., Professor in Wesleyan University. pp. 286. \$1.25.

Dr. Fisk was one of the ablest and most influential of the New England Methodist divines in the first part of the present century, and deserves to be ranked among the American religious leaders of that period. Dr. Prentice has given us an interesting and well written biography in the book before us. The volume opens appropriately with a brief account of the introduction of Methodism in New England near the close of the last century. Dr. Fisk's life was largely devoted to educational work, and in this he was eminently successful. The founding of Wesleyan University and its early prosperity were chiefly due to his energetic and efficient efforts. He possessed superior administrative abilities, which, together with his scholarly qualifications and noble personal traits, gained for him the respect and confidence and affection of his students. He bore a prominent part in the theological controversies of the day, that grew out of the points at issue between Arminianism and Calvinism. He was a vigorous thinker, and exhibited great skill and force in argument. As a preacher he was eloquent and impressive, and was able to adapt himself to the popular mind, which was a chief secret of his success. He was the originator and effective advocate of education societies in the Methodist Episcopal Church. He also rendered very valuable service to the cause of missions and of temperance. His views on the slavery question occasioned surprise and opposition on the part of many of his ministerial brethren. He was twice elected bishop, but preferred to continue in the special work in which he was engaged. Although he died in his forty-seventh year, he accomplished a good and permanent work.

J. B.

Asolando. Fancies and Facts. By Robert Browning. Author's Edition. 1890. pp. 114. Price \$1.25.

The news of the death of Robert Browning, which the press has just sent over the world, will give additional interest to this latest volume of poems from his pen. It seems to have been information from his publisher of the rapid sale of this volume that caused the utterance which proved the poet's last words: "How encouraging."

The title, *Asolando*, connects it with Asola, at which place it was dedicated to his friend, Mrs. Arthur Bronson, and which, through an asso-

ciated tradition, is used to join together the different and otherwise disconnected poems which make up the volume. These poems, in all thirty, longer and shorter, are marked by Browning's peculiar genius. His characteristics are well known to the readers of English poetry, and any attempt to present them is unnecessary here. He has an assured place among English poets. His many admirers will find delight in possessing and reading this additional volume from his pen. M. V.

SCRIBNER & WELFORD, 743 AND 745 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

The Lord's Prayer: A Practical Meditation. By Newman Hall, LL. B. With an Introduction by Theodore Cuyler, D. D., Brooklyn. Second Edition. 1889. pp. 391. Price \$2.00.

The exhaustless fulness of thought in the Lord's Prayer justifies the continual endeavor to set it forth and apply it. "The well is deep." Though this exposition by Rev. Newman Hall is shaped by a practical aim, it draws upon the very depths of the divine truth which the forms of the prayer contain. It deals with the very pith and marrow of the Gospel and is rich in quickening suggestion for ministers in their studies and laymen in their meditations and devotions. It is undoubtedly one of the best of the many monographs that have appeared on our Lord's Prayer. Though the author uses the revised version as the basis of exposition we "are glad that he rejects the restrictive translation which renders τοῦ πονηροῦ, "the Evil One." This rendering is neither called for by the Greek, nor allowed by the connection of the petition, which is the climax of the whole prayer and the comprehensive summing up of all the divine intentions in the "Kingdom" and the aspirations of the human soul after deliverance from all the results of the fall and sin. The author's passing stroke at eucharistic teaching contrary to his own, on p. 171, is uncalled for and uncritical. "Rarely, however, have we a volume covering so extended a range of thought with so little in it to dissent from, and with so much that is rich, edifying and quickening. M. V.

The Kingdom of God; Or Christ's Teaching according to the Synoptical Gospels. By Alexander Balmain Bruce, D. D., Professor of New Testament Exegesis in the Free Church College, Glasgow; author of "The Training of the Twelve," "The Humiliation of Christ," etc., etc. Ex. crown, 8vo. pp. 344. \$2.00. 1889.

The standpoint of Prof. Bruce in this work is that of progressive theology. In his estimate and use of the gospel narratives he shows the influence of the methods designated as the higher criticism. But while giving freer recognition of the human element, he does not reject the supernatural and miraculous factor nor discredit its ruling and controlling place. While the older theory of inspiration is evidently relaxed the records are treated as, in substance, divinely authoritative for

Christian faith and life. His treatment is free though not necessarily destructive. As to theological conclusions, especially as set forth in the final chapter, he shows a very thorough rupture with the characteristic affirmations of the Calvinistic system.

The introductory discussion, of over forty pages, investigates the question of the sources which supplied to the synoptists the materials for their narratives. The answer is sought through the critical method which has recently taken such strong hold of many continental writers—by an examination and comparison of the Gospels themselves, and inference as to what must have been the conditions and processes of their production. The conclusion reached is that not only Luke, but Matthew and Mark as well, used two main sources or *Logia*, viz., one a collection of Christ's sayings, and the other a collection of narrations similar in content to the second Gospel. While these *Logia* were sources and bases of all the synoptical Gospels, the several authors, Matthew, Mark and Luke, each wrote with a distinct special view to the edification of their readers, and by "modifications, omissions and additions" shaped their accounts in the forms and with the divergences in which we now find them. Prof. Bruce's idea does not seem to be that they are untrustworthy by reason of this process of formation, but to account for the differing phraseology in which the essential truth of the Saviour's teaching has been presented to us by the different evangelists. In following the author through this examination, however, one cannot but feel how precarious and unsafe is this whole so-called "higher" critical method, dependent as it is for its conclusions on so many conjectures framed out of the author's ingenuity.

The first chapter of the work proper seeks a settlement of the question of the relation of the kingdom of God, set up by Jesus, to the Old Testament Jewish Kingdom—whether it was to be the same old kingdom or a new kingdom. Undoubtedly Prof. Bruce's conclusion which finds it a new kingdom is fully sustained by the evidences he brings to view, though here and there some of his arguments are unnecessarily strained. In the second chapter the attitude of Christ to the Mosaic law is sought; and in the specific relations of the *Ceremonial* law it is found to be that of complete fulfilment and consequent abrogation, while in reference to the *moral* law he distinctly confirmed its perpetual authority and so deepened the scope of its divine meaning as to include the very innermost states and acts of the soul. The position of the Sabbath law in the moral code is clearly shown, and the Saviour's inclusion of it as permanent for man is briefly but adequately exhibited. Christ recognized it, not simply as Jewish statute, but as "a law of the divine kingdom." Dr. Bruce strikingly calls attention to the inferior position which the synoptical Gospels give to ceremonial matters compared with the great duties of faith, love and righteousness. Chapters follow on the Condition of Entrance into the Kingdom, Christ's Doc-

trine of God, Christ's Doctrine of Man, The Relation of Jesus to Messianic Hopes and Functions, The Son of Man and the Son of God, The Righteousness of the Kingdom, The death of Jesus and its Significance, The Kingdom and the Church, The Parousia and the Christian Era, The History of the Kingdom in Outline, The End, and the Christianity of Christ. The discussion of these most interesting topics, while running occasionally into views at variance with generally accepted theological teaching, and many of which, it seems to us, ought to and must be rejected by a sound theology, is nevertheless full of most quickening and enlarging suggestion and rich for both the mind and heart of discriminating students of the New Testament. Though Dr. Bruce, with the whole school of theological tendency with which he stands connected, is urging toward a dangerous and revolutionizing extreme, as is evident from the closing pages of this volume, there are some great truths in the Gospel which theological dogmatic systems have often obscured or failed properly to emphasize, and which he and those with him are seeking to have recognized. Such recognition of them, if made in the conservative spirit of true theology, will not destroy but enrich at least many of the Church's dogmatic systems, rounding them into fuller completeness and power.

M. V.

A. C. M'CLURG & COMPANY, CHICAGO

Fact Fancy, and Fable: A New Handbook for Ready Reference On Subjects Commonly Omitted from Cyclopaedias; Comprising Personal Soubriquets, Familiar Phrases, Popular Appellations, Geographical Nicknames, Literary Pseudonyms, Mythological Characters, Red-Letter Days, Political Slang, Contractions and Abbreviations, Technical Terms, Foreign Words and Phrases, Americanisms, etc. Compiled by Henry Frederick Reddall. "Trifles make the Sum of Human Things." 1889. Octavo. pp. 536. Price \$350.

We have here another of the class of useful books, like Brewer's *Reader's Handbook*, and *Dictionary of Phrase and Fable*, and Edward's *Words, Facts, and Phrases*. Works of this kind are found to be a perpetual convenience in every library and by all students and readers. The immense amount of serviceable and useful information which they furnish would otherwise be inaccessible or have to be found by long search through scores of different volumes.

Mr. Reddall's work is of comprehensive scope, covering a wide diversity of topics and information. Under "Fact" are included Americanisms, Memorable Days, Pseudonyms, Political Nomenclature, Foreign Words and Sentences, and Contractions and Abbreviations; "Fancy" deals with Personal Soubriquets and Nicknames of all kinds, and with Familiar Phrases and Folk-Sayings; while the realm of the purely mythological belongs to "Fable." The whole department of fictitious characters of satires and novels and of romance and poetry, which form so

large a portion of the works of Wheeler and Brewer, our author has reserved for a further possible volume.

In a work offering such diversified information, often upon remote and obscure or disputed points, gathered out of the shadows of legend or tradition or the by-ways of history, an author's statements can hardly be expected always to be just what all others would have made or may prefer. An examination of this volume satisfies us that the author has exercised great care and has given a work whose information may be accepted with much confidence. It represents an immense amount of research and labor, furnishing much matter that has never been collated in any similar work. It will be found to be a most valuable hand-book.

M. V.

I. KOHLER, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

German for Americans. A Practical Guide for Self-Instruction and for Colleges and Schools. By Dr. Jacob Mayer. pp. 219.

It is surprising that more of our professional men do not make themselves acquainted with the German language, which is spoken by so large a part of our population, and practical knowledge of which would be of such great use to them. Provision is indeed made for this in many of our best colleges, and the opportunity is thus afforded to our young men who are looking forward to the various professions to become familiar with it. Especially should those who are preparing for the ministry in the Lutheran Church gratefully appreciate and improve the facilities afforded them in this direction in our Lutheran Colleges and Seminaries. Many of them, however, strangely and unwisely neglect these opportunities during their college and seminary course, and only when they have entered upon the practice of their profession do they realize and regret their folly. Then they seek to retrieve their loss by securing the services of a private tutor, or, what is the next best thing, by procuring some book that may help them in their private study of the language.

The work to which we now call the attention of the reader has been prepared expressly for the use of such persons, or of any others who wish to prosecute this study privately. It is just what it professes to be, viz., a "Guide to Self-instruction." And we are happy to say that it is, in our opinion, well adapted for this purpose.

To be sure, the attempt which the author makes, viz. to teach the *sounds* of our language by using the *signs* that represent the utterly unlike sounds of another, can never be entirely successful. As some of the sounds in common use by Germans are never heard in English, it is of course absolutely impossible to make the learner understand by the use of English letters the pronunciation of words containing these foreign sounds. It is better at once to acknowledge this fact and say to the learner—"for the accurate pronunciation of these words we must refer you to a living teacher."

Dr. Mayer has, nevertheless, made an earnest effort to do this very thing. And he has no difficulty in the case of the strong consonants, as the use of them is common to most languages, but he is specially fortunate with some of the vowels, particularly with the unlauded ones. Thus he makes no difference between the vowel sounds in the first syllables of *Erben* and *hätte*. He makes the raised sound of *o* equivalent to the English *i* in *girl* and to *u* in *hurt*. He transliterates *Oefen* by *i-fen*, and *böse* by *bi-ze*; and *Töchterlhen* by *tih-ter-hen*.

The author furnishes a full series of progressive exercises, with an interlinear translation, that will be found very useful. The main feature of the book is an extended course of conversations on familiar topics, illustrating and applying the grammatical rules.

Dr. Mayer clearly apprehends the principal difficulty that English speaking persons find in learning to speak and write German, viz., the *determination of the gender of nouns*. To aid the learner in overcoming this difficulty he displays the most common nouns in the language alphabetically arranged in parallel columns, the three genders side by side, and follows this up with an admirable set of rules for distinguishing the gender.

The rapid multiplication of books of this kind we hail as a pleasing proof of the growing interest taken in the study of this language. *

D. APPLETON & CO., NEW YORK.

Christianity and Agnosticism. A Controversy consisting of Papers.

By Henry Wace, D. D., Prof. Thomas H. Huxley, the Bishop of Peterborough, W. H. Mallock, Mrs. Humphrey Ward. pp. 329. 50cts.

Here we have the battle of the giants, raging around the citadel. Intense interest was awakened by the Controversy on Agnosticism in "The Nineteenth Century" between Dr. Wace and Prof. Huxley, the Christian world in particular exulting over the acknowledged victory of their brave champion. Valuable side lights are thrown upon the general subject of the discussion by Mr. Mallock's paper on "Cowardly Agnosticism," and Mrs. Ward's article on the "New Reformation." Every scholar interested in the burning question of the day will want this collection of very able papers.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, NEW YORK.

To the Lions: A Tale of the Early Christians. By Rev. Alfred J. Church, M. A., Professor of Latin in University College, London.

With sixteen Illustrations by H. M. Paget. pp. 258.

An intensely interesting story, portraying the life and persecutions of the early Christians. The time is that of the Younger Pliny, in the reign of Trajan. The writer has succeeded wonderfully well in presenting many incidents of Roman life and methods. The trial of the Christians is good, but the amphitheatre, its gladiatorial fights, etc., still

better. Mr. Church, as Professor of Latin, is well qualified to speak of Roman antiquities, and he has woven them into his story with much skill.

Principles of Procedure in Deliberative Bodies. By George Glover Crocker, President of Massachusetts Senate, 1883. pp. 167. 75 cts. [On Sale by J. B. Lippincott Co.]

What a beneficent reform might be enacted in our ecclesiastical bodies if some far-seeing benefactor would present a copy of this manual to all our presiding officers, and manage at the same time to have them read and follow it.

AMERICAN BAPTIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA.

An American Commentary on the New Testament. Edited by Alvah Hovey, D. D., LL. D. *The Epistle to the Romans.* By Rev. D. B. Ford. pp. 328.

Commendation of this work, which has now reached the eighth volume, has been freely and repeatedly given in the *QUARTERLY*. It is very properly termed an "American Commentary," being not simply the product of American scholarship, but adapted to the American mind, clear, compact, practical. It is a proof, too, that practical and superficial are not interchangeable terms in expository authorship. This work on Romans is not unworthy of "the profoundest treatise of inspiration," and it must be welcomed as a most timely appearance. The old doctrines of universal depravity, vicarious atonement, and solafidian justification stand out clearly and firmly like rocks amid the seething billows, and those who think that the old doctrines of election and divine sovereignty have suddenly sunk away, will do well to read once more what modern biblical scholars have to say on Romans IX.

The material part of the present volume was prepared by Dr. A. N. Arnold, but his health having failed before its completion, his manuscript was placed in the hands of Mr. Ford, to fill out and complete. His additions, whether original or selected, are either enclosed in square brackets in the body of the text, or else are inserted as footnotes, with the initials of his name attached.

The labors of these authors are throughout enriched by a very judicious use of such masters as Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, Olshausen, Meyer, Philippi, Hodge and Schaff. Of Luther's addition of "allein" 3 : 28, Mr. F. says: "The meaning is in the text, but a translation did not require its express statement." Luther, however, it is well known, held that a German translation, in order to bring out the full meaning of the text, does require its express statement, and the revised Lutheran translation retains it.

Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews. By A. C. Kendrick, D. D. pp. 207.

Just as the printer calls for the copy of book-notices another volume of the same series reaches our hands, too late for even the most cursory examination. But an exegetical work from Dr. Kendrick needs no examination from the reviewer to assure our readers of its quality. His competence and his fidelity as an expositor of the New Testament are not surpassed in this country. We are glad to see him agree with Luther and many recent writers in ascribing the authorship of the Epistle to Apollos. "The grounds for a certain conclusion are doubtless wanting; but all the positive evidence tends in this direction."

PAMPHLETS.

The Lutheran Almanac and Year-Book for 1890. Edited by M. Shee-leigh, D. D., and published by the Lutheran Publication Society, 42 North Ninth St., Philadelphia.

This excellent little manual, which has always been good, is growing better every year. It has increased this year to 72 pages.

Evangelischer Kalender für 1890. pp. 126. 18 cts. Herausgegeben von der Evangel. Synode von Nord-America.

This body, commonly known as the "Unirten" or Prussian Union numbers in this country 842 congregations and 648 pastors. All its publications are sold by Pastor R. Wobus, St. Charles, Mo.

Studies in the four Gospels. By Rev. Jesse L. Hurlbut, D. D. pp. 80. 25 cts.

Designed as a help in the unfolding of Scripture, which, the author justly assumes, must ever be its own interpreter.

History of the Evangelical Lutheran Tennessee Synod. Published at New Market, Va.

The publishers have sent us 56 pp. of the advance sheets of what promises to be an exhaustive and trustworthy History of the Tennessee Synod. It promises to throw much light upon the general history of the Lutheran Church in America.

Addresses delivered at the inauguration of Drs. L. A. Gotwald and S. F. Breckenridge, in Wittenberg Theological Seminary. Springfield, Ohio. pp. 56.

These addresses show very clearly that these new theological professors appreciate the significance of teaching in a Lutheran school and for the Lutheran Church.